



# John Adams Library,



IN THE CUSTODY OF THE  
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.



SHELF N<sup>o</sup>  
★ ADAMS  
211.4





















A  
CANDID EXAMINATION

OF  
Dr. MAYHEW'S Observations  
ON THE  
CHARTER AND CONDUCT  
OF THE

SOCIETY for the propagation of the Gospel  
in foreign parts.

Interspers'd with a few brief reflections upon some other of the  
DOCTOR'S Writings.

To which is added,

A

LETTER to a FRIEND,

Containing a short Vindication of the said SOCIETY  
against the Mistakes and Misrepresentations of the Doctor in his  
Observations on the Conduct of that Society.

By one of its Members.

---

Where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work.  
Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My  
brethren, these things ought not so to be. James iii. 16. 10.

---

BOSTON, NEW-ENGLAND:

Printed and Sold by THOMAS and JOHN FLEET, in Cornhill; and  
GREEK & RUSSELL, and EDES & GILL, in Queenstreet, 1763.

ADAMS 21174

# The CONTENTS.

THE reason why Dr. <i>Mayhew's</i> Observations were not fully answered before.	page 1.
The author's charitable design in the present publication.	2.
The method he proposes in this examination.	ibid.
Does not purpose to confine himself to the observations.	ibid.
The Dr's description of controversial writers apply'd to himself.	ibid.
Instances of a candid temper in the Dr.	3.
Requests the candor of his readers.	ibid.
How far this is allowed.	4.
The Dr's. design.	ibid.
Attempts to prove the Society have counteracted the design of their institution.	5.
That they are guilty of a wilful abuse of their trust.	ibid.
Denies it again. 6. Prov'd upon him.	6.
Charges the missionaries with abusing the Society.	ibid.
This pretence refuted.	7.
Will not allow the Society to understand the state of religion in the plantations.	ibid.
This point examined and refuted.	10.
The Society prov'd to understand the state of religion, &c. and also their charter.	16.
The Dr. beholden to Mr. Hobart for most of his observations,	19.
Yet takes no notice of Mr. Beach's reply to Mr. Hobart.	20.
The Dr's interpretation of the Society's charter examined and shewn to be inconsistent.	ibid.
His argument from King William refuted.	23.
His other testimonies in favour of his interpretation nothing to his purpose. e. g.	
The name and title of the Society considered.	39.
Their common seal. 41. Their sermons.	42.
True design of the charter, to which the foregoing testimonies are conformable.	22.
And to the Society's conduct.	43.
The word orthodox not properly apply'd to dissenters.	25.
In common use denotes the establishment.	ibid.
Establishments examined.	26.
New-England churches not established.	27.
Proved from their own confession.	ibid.
From a letter of the Lords Justices to Lt. Gov <sup>r</sup> Dummer.	28.
From the Dr's own method of arguing.	32.
The church of England established in the colonies.	33.
This proved by several acts of parliament and particularly by the act of union.	34.
An objection answered.	38.
From the King's granting the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the plantations to the Bishop of London.	39.



## The CONTENTS.

Some farther reflections on the extent of the charter and conduct of the Society.	40.
Why few missionaries were early sent into New-England.	ibid.
Objections against the Society for neglecting the Indians and the other colonies answered.	44.
Much hindered by a party spirit.	ibid.
Two or three instances mentioned.	45.
In many of the colonies religion supported by the civil government.	46.
Account of the first adventurers to N. E. with their character.	ibid.
The Dr. no right to plead their merit, who has departed from their principles.	47.
Early adventurers of two sorts.	51.
Massachusetts-Bay settled by church of England men.	49.
Proved from their own letter dated on board the Arabella at their leaving England.	50.
Rev. Mr. Prince's testimony to the same purpose.	51.
Did not leave England on account of persecution.	52.
The Dr. accuses the Ch. of England as a persecuting church.	53.
This examined and reply'd to.	54.
Recriminations would be easy.	ibid.
Two or three instances hinted at.	55.
The Dr's writings have a tendency to beget a persecuting spirit.	57.
Labours to prejudice people against Bishops by speaking rudely and contemptibly of that Order.	59.
The indecency of this as they are an order of men established from the beginning of Christianity, and received or venerated by foreign protestants at this day.	60.
Calvin's testimony in favor of that order. 60. and Beza's.	61.
The Dr's. ridicule of the liturgy of the Ch. of England shewn to be indecent by the opinion of foreign churches.	62.
Summary representation of the controversy:	64.
The Dr's. no proper method to rectify mistakes, if the Society have committed any.	66.
The publishing an open account of the success of the other Society more proper to effect this.	67.
Rev. Mr. Wheelock's Indian charity school recommended.	68.
The Dr. has no right to complain of any severe expression used by the author.	69.
This shewn from a specimen of his own language, taken from his observations and sermons.	70.
A serious address to the rev. Gentlemen of the ministry at Boston.	77.
The Dr. drolls upon the Song of Solomon.	79.
Gives countenance to the doctrine of annihilation.	ibid.
Ill consequence of his writings to civil government.	ibid.
This not the general temper of people in the colonies.	80.
Conclusion.	ibid.

---

A Candid Examination of Dr. MAYHEW'S  
Observations on the Charter and Conduct  
of the Society for the Propagation of the  
Gospel in Foreign Parts, &c.

IT is a long time since Dr. MAYHEW published his *modest* observations, on the charter and conduct of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts; and as no person hitherto has thought it worth his while to enter into a special examination of his principal argument, he probably concluded that his performance would not have met with a full reply. And in truth if he had drawn this conclusion from the nature and manner of his writing, as being too intemperately manag'd to deserve the notice of either a Gentleman or a Scholar, he had thought as other men do; for this, it has been said is the true reason, why he has been suffer'd to triumph thus long in his performance, and to boast of it as unanswerable. Every gentleman who has had a liberal and polite education, thinks it beneath his character to enter the lists with one who observes no measures of decency or good manners, nay who does not scruple to sacrifice the meek and gentle spirit of the Gospel to the gratification of a licentious and ungovern'd temper. Nor does the author of the present remarks pretend to rival him in this unbecoming talent; herein he is al-

low'd to reign without a competitor. But since he is liable to "think more highly of himself than he ought to think," and is already unhappily "wiser in his own conceit," than in any ones else; it may be esteem'd an act of charity to give him juster notions both of himself, and of his writings in general, but especially of his late performance, than he seems to have entertain'd.

THE method which will be used in discharging this charitable office, will be to represent the Doctor sometimes in the meek and benevolent light in which he affects to be considered; at other times, and by way of contrast to this, he will be produced in the light in which he has really exhibited himself: For altho' these are toto cœlo different, yet without a just and impartial representation of him in both these respects, it will be impossible to give him a true knowledge of himself, which is a point the author is very solicitous of; and is not without reasonable hopes of accomplishing.

To this purpose the author proposes to consult the Doctor's writings in general, which, as they are sufficiently voluminous, will afford abundant matter for such a representation, and being all of them corrected with his own hand, and sent abroad by his own appointment, may fairly be conceived to be a genuine picture of the man.

IT will be proper to begin with his last and highly boasted piece, entitled *Observations on the charter and conduct of the Society*, &c. The Introduction to which begins with these remarkable words, "There are some men who write—controversy merely from a wrangling disposition, without any regard to truth, right, or the importance of the matters contested." Now one may defy any man



man who shall read this passage, and especially if he has read two or three volumes of sermons published in Boston since the year 1754, and some occasional thanksgiving discourses, in almost every one of which matters of controversy have been dragg'd in, tho' for the most part as it were by head and shoulders; I say, I defy any such man, not to think of one who stiles himself *pastor of the west church in Boston*. And no doubt every one will be ready to join with the Dr. in the words immediately following, "that this is a turn of mind unbecoming a christian."

And had he not been too unhappily inattentive to his own maxim as before cited, doubtless he would here have dropp'd his pen. "But some of his "friends" too "partial" indeed "in his favor" injudiciously prevented him from profiting by his own admonition, having it seems "expressed a desire that" notwithstanding "*his*" great "*aversion to controversy*" —he would—communicate *some* of his thoughts "to the public, on the point in question." †

IN the 8th page of his observations, the Doctor affects to be very candid and ingenuous. "He is "sensible" he says, "that the Society are a very respectable Body, and to be treated with all the "regard that is consistent with truth and justice— "he declares it is by no means his intention to "charge that venerable Body with any *wilful* known "misconduct, or improper application of monies." This is very commendable, if he had but kept it in mind through the whole of his polite inquiry; but as though he was sensible he should very soon break through the aforesaid equitable rule, "he requests "the candor of his readers, that no advantage may "be taken of any *incautious expression* that may "escape him in the pursuit of his argument, even "tho'

“ tho’ it should at *first view*, have the *appearance* of “ such an accusation.” † This however is a reasonable postulatam, and therefore it is not proposed, nay, the author hereby promises the gentleman that he will not take advantage of *one* or even of *two* incautious expressions, that appear undesignedly to have escaped him, if at *first view only* they have the *bare appearance* of such an accusation ; but then he cannot extend the same indulgence to *very many* expressions importing a charge of wilful known misconduct, and improper application of monies ; especially, if not only at the *first view*, but on a second and third view, they do not appear to have merely escaped him, but were manifestly intended to support such an accusation. Much less will he be intitled to this indulgence, if it shall appear that the Society are directly charged by him with misapplication of the monies committed to their trust, in numerous passages of his book, but moreover, that the general design of it was, an attempt to prove this very point.

THE Dr.’s book is entitled “ Observations on the “ charter and conduct of the Society, &c. *designed* “ to shew their non-conformity to each other.” In support of this title, after sometimes contracting, then stretching and wire-drawing the sense of the charter, seal, &c. of the Society, he concludes that the *sole* design of their institution was to propagate the gospel among the heathen, or in those colonies whose religious state was, and according to him, now is, little better than heathenism. But this which he asserts to be the laudable and only design of their institution, they have, he says, grossly perverted and abused.

THUS

THUS in page 55, he says "the Society have manifested a sufficient forwardness to encourage and increase small disaffected parties in our towns, upon an application to them." And in the 57th page he represents the Society as hoping that these small parties will by their influence gradually bring on a general submission to an episcopal sovereign; and affirms that this has long been the formal design of the Society, and is the true plan and grand mystery of their operations in New-England."

IN his 106th page he tells us that the "affair of Bishops in America, has been a favourite object with the Society," and in the next page, that the Society spare neither endeavours, applications, nor expence, in order to effect their *grand design* of *episcopizing* all New-England," and a few lines further, "The Society have long had a *formal design* to dissolve and root out all our New-England churches.—This (he says) fully and clearly accounts for their being so ready to encourage small episcopal parties all over New-England, by sending them missionaries." In page 110 he affirms that "the Society have been expending large sums every year in New-England, *quite beyond the design of their institution*, to support and increase the episcopal party as such." In the same page he charges the Society with robbing the heathen to ease and gratify the episcopalians here, and forms this conclusion upon his foregoing representations, that "the Society are guilty of a flagrant abuse of a noble institution." And in the 112th page, that they have "alienated their revenues from a truly noble to a comparatively mean, narrow, party design." After these several direct and plain accusations of the Society as abusing their trust, and misapplying the money



money put into their hands, he wipes his mouth again, and absurdly enough assures his reader, that "he would by no means be understood as charging "so respectable a Body with any wilful criminal "abuse of power, or misapplication of monies." i. e. he would not have the reader believe him; for that is the sense of his words, as they stand connected with what went before, if indeed they have any sense at all in them.

WILL he now have the *firmness* to assert, that all the *expressions* and passages which have been here quoted (and five times as many more might have been added) are only *incautious expressions*, that inadvertently *escaped him*, that they are not designed as matter of *accusation*, and that if possibly they have such an *appearance*, it is only *at first view*? If he should assert this, I am persuaded his friends at least must blush for him. - Is the supporting small parties in New-England, in order to facilitate the affair of *episcopizing* the colonies, *the formal design* of the Society, to which they give their chief attention, and to which the largest part of their fund is applied? Can he assert all this, and yet say that he does not charge that venerable Body "with any "wilful known misconduct, or improper application "of monies"?

PERHAPS this *consistent* reasoner will chuse to say that the Society are misled, and form their plan upon the misrepresentations of their *wicked* missionaries. Something like this is asserted in a note upon a thanksgiving sermon on the reduction of Canada, preached and published by him in the year 1760. "It is probable that they [the Society] have "been grossly imposed upon by false representations "of the state of religion in these parts, which has

" been

“ been the occasion of their employing so much of  
 “ their charitable care about those who so little need-  
 “ ed it, to the neglect of those who were perishing  
 “ for want of it: For which impositions, abuses and  
 “ misapplications, their deceivers are answerable; if  
 “ not to them, yet certainly to an HIGHER AU-  
 “ THORITY.” But surely whatever representations  
 these missionaries have made, the Society must  
 judge whether the complying with such representa-  
 tions was, or was not consistent with their charter;  
 so that notwithstanding his striving to palliate his  
 accusation of the Society, by casting the odium of  
 a pretended misapplication of their charity on the  
 missionaries, the slander will still remain where he at  
 first placed it, on the Society themselves. Besides, the  
 members of the Society are not all of them utterly  
 unacquainted with the plantations; some of them  
 have heretofore, and others do even now reside in  
 most of the governments upon the continent, (New-  
 England not excepted) many of them not inconfi-  
 derable for their station, wisdom and integrity.  
 These gentlemen must therefore be also in a combi-  
 nation with the missionaries to abuse the world, and  
 misapply the monies entrusted with them. This seems  
 to be the consequence of his general accusation.

IF the Dr. would say any thing further to  
 soften the odium of this accusation which he has  
 cast upon the Society, it must be by asserting that  
 they did not understand their own charter; this, if  
 true, may serve in some measure to take off the  
 charge of wilful abuse and misapplication; and that  
 he supposes it true is clear from hence, that he has  
 spent many pages and employed his great learning  
 and penetration in explaining this intricate charter;  
 that the Society may no longer misapply their cha-  
 rity

rity for want of understanding the real design of their institution. It may be questioned however, whether his refin'd criticism and curious explanation will merit the thanks of the venerable board. That untoward word *orthodox*, which so much raises his indignation wherever he meets with it, will not perhaps after all his learned pains, fairly comprehend the dissenters from a national establishment. However that be, there is certainly no method of reconciling his candid professions of justice, decency and respect towards the Society, or his solemn declaration that it is not his intention to charge that venerable Body with *wilful known* misconduct: I say, it is impossible to reconcile these things, with the numerous abuses, accusations and indecencies which have been already produced, and with which he has treated that respectable Body directly or implicitly, in almost every page of his book.

- IN short, the Society either have, or have not acted contrary to the meaning and design of their charter; that they have not, is at least highly probable from the character of wisdom, honor and piety, which the world will generally allow to those of them at least, who are chiefly active and interested in managing their affairs. If they have acted contrary to the design of it, as the Dr. affirms (and pretends to think he has prov'd) they have either done so *wilfully*, or thro' ignorance. That they have not done it wilfully, the Dr. himself allows; it remains then, according to him, that their misconduct is owing to ignorance: Either they have misunderstood the true and real design of their charter, or have not a competent knowledge of the state of religion in the plantations, or how their affairs are conducted there, being imposed on by the representation



representation of their missionaries, or that both these things concur to mislead them, into an abuse of their institution. The latter seems to be his sense of the thing, viz. that they are ignorant both of the true meaning of their charter, and also of the state of religion in the plantations; for he says in the close of his introduction, that “the profess’d design of his observations is to shew, that they (the “Society) have in some respects counteracted and “defeated the truly noble ends of their INSTITU-  
“TION, however *contrary to their intention.*” Whether they have done so or not, will fall under examination hereafter. In the mean time I shall take leave of his introduction with this single remark, that from the passages already quoted, as well as from many others that might have been produced from this curious book of observations, it appears that the professions of candor and ingenuity which the Dr. set out with, and his declaration of respect for so venerable a body as the Society, are mere affectation and grimace, and tend only to prove that he “knows not what manner of spirit he is of.”

It was observed before, that according to the Dr’s representation the Society are ignorant of the true sense and meaning of their charter, and also of the state of religion in the plantations; for he asserts that they have greatly perverted the design of their institution, and yet will not allow their misconduct to be wilful; it remains therefore that their misapplication of the trust they have undertaken, is owing to ignorance.

It will be proper therefore to inquire first, Whether the Society must not be supposed to have a competent knowledge of the state of religion in the plantations, so far at least as relates to the design of their incorporation. And, B 2. Whether

2 Whether they may not also reasonably be supposed to understand the true sense, meaning and design of their charter ; for if these two things can be proved to the satisfaction of disinterested and unprejudiced people, it will follow, either that the Society are not chargeable with misconduct and misapplication of their charity, or if they are so, that such misconduct is known, wilful and intended, which the Dr. does not allow.

The first thing to be examined is, Whether the Society have not a competent knowledge of the state of religion in the plantations. Dr. Humphries in his history of the Society page 22d, acquaints us, that “ upon their first engaging in this work the Society presently perceived it consisted of three great branches, the care and instruction of our own people, settled in the colonies ; the conversion of the Indian Savages, and the conversion of the Negroes. The English planters had a title to their first care” &c.—“ The Society began therefore with the English, and soon found there was more to be done among them, than they had as yet any views of effecting.” He then proceeds to give “ a small sketch of the state and condition of each colony, formed from accounts, the Governors, and persons of the best note, sent over to the corporation.” I shall omit what is said of the southern *heathenish* colonies as Dr. Mayhew *modestly* calls them, because these he allows to be proper objects of the Society’s charity, and proceed to the state of religion in New-England as represented in the history before mentioned. After speaking of the first settlement of the country, and the state of religion in the early days of it, Dr. Humphries proceeds to say,—“ Since that time great numbers  
“ of

“ of people, members of the church of England,  
 “ have at different times settled there, who thought  
 “ themselves surely entitled, by the very New-  
 “ England charter to a liberty of conscience in the  
 “ worshipping of God after their own way. Yet  
 “ the Independents (it seems) were not of this sen-  
 “ timent, but acted as an *establishment*.” “ The  
 “ members of the church of England in Boston  
 “ met with so much obstruction in attempting to set  
 “ up that form of worship, that they were obliged  
 “ to petition the King for protection. Their peti-  
 “ tion was granted, and a Church thereupon erect-  
 “ ed, which occasioned the members of the church  
 “ of England in many other towns in New-England  
 “ to declare their desire of the like advantage, and  
 “ accordingly wrote very zealous letters to bishop  
 “ Compton, for ministers; and now it appeared  
 “ they were a very considerable body of people.”\*

From these several passages, it appears that the Society did not proceed hastily and without due caution and information of the state of religion in the colonies which they proposed to assist. Dr. Humphries goes on and sums up the religious state of the colonies in a brief representation of it, from the memorials of Governor Dudley, Col. Morris, and Col. Heathcote. I shall pass over the southern colonies for the reason before mentioned, and come to New-England.—“ In Connecticut colony in New-England

“ there are about 30000 souls, of which when  
 “ they have a minister among them, about 150  
 “ frequent the church, and there are 35 commu-  
 “ nicants. In Rhode-Island and Narraganset, which  
 “ is one government, there are about 10000 souls,  
 “ of which about 150 frequent the church, and  
 “ there are 30 communicants. In Boston and Pis-



“ cataway governments, there are about 80000  
 “ souls, of which about 600 frequent the church,  
 “ and 120 the sacrament.”

After such particular information from the memorials of these honorable persons, perhaps no man except Dr. Mayhew and his voucher, will suppose the Society could be ignorant of the state of religion in this part of the world, nor consequently where it was most proper to employ their charity. Agreeably Dr. Humphreys acquaints us that “ the Govern-  
 “ nors of several colonies, and other Gentlemen of  
 “ character abroad, and merchants here in London,  
 “ having given such a particular description of the  
 “ religious state of the plantations ; the Society  
 “ found it was high time to enter upon the good  
 “ work” \* especially as “ great numbers of the in-  
 “ habitants of various humors, and different tenets  
 “ in religion, began to contend with great zeal,  
 “ which should be first supplied with ministers of  
 “ the church of England, and wrote very earnest  
 “ letters to the Society—They (the Society) thought  
 “ any further delay now would be inexcusable, after  
 “ the people had pressed so earnestly for their as-  
 “ sistance.” Yet as if all this care was insufficient,  
 and that the Society might leave no method unat-  
 tempted, for gaining a more perfect knowlege of  
 the state of religion in the colonies, “ before they  
 “ proceeded to appoint missionaries to particular  
 “ places, (they) resolved to send a travelling missio-  
 “ nary, who should travel over, and preach in the  
 “ several Governments, on the continent of the British  
 “ America.” † Accordingly they did send the Rev.  
 Mr. Keith, who landed at Boston on the 11th of  
 June 1702. and in the course of two years travel'd  
 over

\* Humph. Hist. p. 44, 45.

† Ditto 73, 74.

over and preached in all the Governments betwixt Piscataway river and North-Carolina inclusively, when having finished his mission he returned to England, and published a full account of his labours. † One thing in his narrative I shall just mention, viz. That  
 “ in divers parts of New-England, he found not  
 “ only many people well affected to the Church,  
 “ who had no church of England ministers, but  
 “ also several New-England ministers desirous of  
 “ episcopal ordination, and ready to embrace the  
 “ church worship, some of whom both hospita-  
 “ bly entertained Mr. Keith and Mr. Talbot (who  
 “ had joined Mr. Keith as an assistant) in their  
 “ houses, and requested them to preach in their  
 “ congregations, which they did, and received great  
 “ thanks, both from the ministers and from the  
 “ people.”\*

“ Mr. Keith in the conclusion of his narrative re-  
 “ presented to the Society, the want of a great num-  
 “ ber of ministers for a people dispersed over such  
 “ large countries,” and among others makes mention  
 of Narraganset, Swansea, Little Compton & Rhode-  
 Island in New-England, which Places had engaged  
 him to present their humble requests to the Society,  
 to send ministers among them. †

Yet notwithstanding this particular information,  
 supported by many earnest petitions from the plan-  
 tations for ministers of the church of England,  
 “ the Society thro’ the whole management of the  
 “ trust, have been so far from obtruding the church  
 “ of England worship upon any sort of people  
 “ abroad—that they have not been able to give any  
 “ assistance to great numbers of people, who have  
 “ in very moving terms, with a true christian spirit  
 “ requested

† Humph. Hist. p. 74.

\* Ditto 78, 79.

† Ditto. . . .

“ requested it ; and whom they *knew* to stand very  
 “ much in want of it. There remain upon  
 “ their books numerous petitions of this sort.”—  
 I shall omit those from the southern colonies, for  
 the reasons before mentioned, and proceed to that  
 of New-England, which as Dr. Humphreys acquaints  
 us (page 61) “ tho’ before provided with an inde-  
 “ pendent and presbyterian ministry, yet had great  
 “ numbers of inhabitants, who could not follow  
 “ that persuasion, but were exceeding desirous of  
 “ worshipping God, after the manner of the church  
 “ of England. I shall give the reader (says he) a  
 “ few petitions which shew plainly the Society did  
 “ not concern themselves here, till they were loudly  
 “ called upon ; and that the inhabitants in many  
 “ places, did not only send petitions for ministers,  
 “ but also built churches before they had any mi-  
 “ nisters, which is an uncontrollable evidence—  
 “ that the people themselves desired to have the  
 “ church of England worship, with a hearty zeal and  
 “ true sincerity.” The Dr. then proceeds to specify  
 as petitioners several inhabitants of Rhode-Island,  
 Narraganset, Newbury, Marblehead, New-Hampshire,  
 Little Compton and Tiverton, Braintree near Boston,  
 and Stratford in Connecticut. \* “ The case of these  
 “ two last towns he tells us was also further recom-  
 “ mended to the Society’s care, by gentlemen of  
 “ considerable figure and interest. Colonel Morris  
 “ pressed very earnestly for a minister for Braintree,  
 “ and Colonel Heathcote, for another, for the peo-  
 “ ple of Connecticut colony ; great numbers of  
 “ whom were very earnest to have a minister of the  
 “ church of England. Robert Hunter, Esq; Go-  
 “ vernor of New-York, in the year 1711, writes  
 “ thus

\* Humph. Hist. p. 61, 62.



“ thus to the Society, concerning the people at  
 “ Stratford : When I was at Connecticut, those of  
 “ our communion at the church at Stratford, came  
 “ to me in a body ; and then, as they have since  
 “ by letter, begged my intercession with the véné-  
 “ rable Society, and the right reverend the Lord  
 “ bishop of London, for a missionary ; they ap-  
 “ peared very much in earnest, and are the best set  
 “ of men I met with in that country.”

How these several testimonies which have been  
 produc'd will operate upon Dr. Mayhew, it is not  
 easy to say ; but to the sober, judicious and unpreju-  
 diced, the following conclusions may perhaps be  
 thought fairly drawn, viz. That the Society have  
 omitted no proper means of information concern-  
 ing the state of religion in the colonies—That their  
 religious state must therefore be competently known  
 to that venerable board—And that if they have  
 been guilty of any notorious misconduct or misap-  
 plication of their charity, it could not be owing to  
 ignorance of the true condition of things abroad,  
 but must be attributed to some other cause : For  
 allowing what the Dr. has most uncharitably inti-  
 mated, that the missionaries have misrepresented the  
 condition of things among us, and by that means  
 endeavoured to mislead the Society to an improper  
 application of the monies lodged in their hands ;  
 yet can any modest person suppose that Governors  
 of colonies, merchants, and other gentlemen of  
 character, have all along combined with the said  
*wicked* missionaries, to abuse and mislead the Society  
 into a wrong disposition of their charity ? Or is it  
 probable that their own members, several of whom  
 do reside in the colonies, should conspire with the  
 worthy persons before mentioned to carry on the  
 deceit ?

deceit? It is hoped the Dr. himself is not so far involved in a party spirit as to affirm the probability of this, if he is, without doubt he is alone in such an uncharitable censure. And therefore this point may be left without any further remarks, to the public opinion.

The second Inquiry is; Whether the Society may not reasonably be supposed to understand the true sense, meaning and design of their Charter.

To those who examine the list of members of which the Society is composed, as it is exhibited in the yearly abstract of their proceedings, the present inquiry will appear very extraordinary. That a Sett of Gentlemen, many of them highly distinguish'd in the world for their great parts, and extensive knowledge, should mistake, or be at a loss about the true meaning of a charter, which has nothing at all in it that is intricate or obscure, is what no reasonable person will admit. And notwithstanding the Dr's *refined criticism*, some may perhaps imagine that it must argue no small measure of self-sufficiency in any person to oppose his single sentiment, to that of so learned and respectable a body. Few besides the Dr. himself, will really believe that they needed his assistance for acquiring a right understanding of their charter. If we should suppose, that those very learned divines, who from the beginning have composed a considerable part of that body, should be less acquainted with the phrase and purport of an instrument in some measure foreign to their profession; yet doubtless the Lord Chancellor, the chief Justices of the King's Bench and common pleas, whose peculiar profession it is, may be supposed to understand the nature of instruments of this kind. And as the Society are obliged to exhibit an annual account of their

their proceedings to these very learned and worthy persons, it is surprizing that they should suffer them to proceed above 60 years, without once acquainting them that their conduct was not agreeable to the *Letter and Spirit* of their charter. That the Society should at last be obliged to a *profound critic* in New-England for an ellucidation of this kind, after having so many years stood the test of an annual examination, by those whom the royal wisdom thought proper to appoint as their supervisors——Believe it they that can—

Some friend of the Dr's may possibly here cry out, what would this remarker be at? The Dr. has plainly prov'd that the Society have been guilty of great misconduct, have acted quite inconsistent with the intent and design of their charter, and from a principle of charity is willing to impute it to misinformation; or ignorance; while this writer who affects to be the friend of the Society is labouring to defeat the Dr's benevolent purpose, and seems as tho' he designed to prove their misconduct to be wilful.

After thanking the candid Dr. for his good intention, the author confesses it is his opinion, and he thinks it has in some measure been prov'd; either that the Society have not acted inconsistent with their charter, or if they have done so, that it was knowingly, wilfully and designedly done. The author thinks, as all reasonable men must think, that the Society do very well understand the design and meaning of their charter—And also that they have a competent knowledge of the state of religion in the plantations.

If these two things are allowed, the conclusion will unavoidably be what was mentioned before, viz.



either that the Society have *wilfully* misconducted, or else, that there has been no misconduct in the case.—That they have *wilfully* misconducted the Dr. disallows, therefore, there has been no misconduct at all.—Here then the argument and imputation which the Dr. has cast upon the Society, drop of course.

However, tho' the Dr. has been candid enough to clear the Society from any intentional abuse of their charter, possibly others may not be so ingenuous. Besides it may be esteemed unfair to take this advantage of the Dr's concession, to the neglect of those many curious arguments he has brought to prove what he had before given up; for notwithstanding the inconsistency of it, he has throughout his book laboured to prove (that which he gave up in the beginning;) that the Society have really been guilty of wilful and designed abuse of their trust. And therefore the author hopes the Dr. will forgive it, if upon a general view of the observations, he is led to question the sincerity of that declaration before mentioned, viz. “ That it is not his intention  
“ to charge that venerable body (the Society) with  
“ any wilful known misconduct or improper appli-  
“ cation of monies.”

Mr. Noah Hobart (whom by the way the Dr. has dubb'd a *bishop*, for his heroic exploits in this controversy) has plainly spoke out, and directly charged the Society, with a designed abuse and perversion of their trust, at least since the first ten years after their incorporation,† though indeed like the Dr. he afterwards seems disposed in some measure to retract the charge, and chuses rather to impute it to their ignorance of the state of religion in New-England,  
and

† Hobart's 2d Address, p. 126. compare'd with following pages.

and to the imposition and misrepresentation of their *wicked* millionaries. \* But the author conceives it has already been proved that their conduct cannot be imputed to a want of knowledge, and whatever the disposition of Mr. Hobart or his copier may be, it is presumed that an accusation of the Society as wilfully betraying their trust, will be received by the impartial world, with the resentment it deserves. It is not the Society alone, who are thus unjustly arraigned by these licentious pens, but the integrity and honor of their inspectors also, the Lord chancellor and the chief justices of the King's bench, who yearly examine and approve their transactions, do of consequence suffer impeachment by their calumny; nay the extensive abuse reaches to every benefactor to that Society, who, as an annual account of their proceedings is published and put into their hands, must be supposed to approve them, since otherwise it is more than probable they would have withdrawn their assistance.

As for the learned and ingenious Dr. Mayhew, he certainly descended very low, when he vouchsafed to become the transcriber of Mr. Hobart's address, for (excepting some personal reflections upon his antagonist) there appears little else throughout his observations, besides a servile copying of that curious *piece of defamation*. The method indeed he may claim to himself, and sometimes the phrase and manner of expression. The Dr. owns "the book has been of service to him," and promised to "make proper acknowledgments wherever he should make use of it" yet has not perhaps always been so good as his word; nor will the empty honor of a *bishop* which he arbitrarily confers on him, be allow'd a  
sufficient

\* Vid. Hob. 2d Address, p. 145.

sufficient compensation for the liberties of this kind which he has taken. He asserts that " Mr. Hobart wrote so solidly, and judiciously upon the subject, that it was hardly needful for him to say any thing," this is granted, unless he could have advanced something new, which the other had not offer'd before ; especially as Mr. Hobart's peice received as solid and judicious an answer, which the Dr. thought proper wholly to neglect. In truth, had the Dr. but carefully read the Rev. Mr. Beach's dispassionate but masterly reply to Mr. Hobart's second address, he might have seen a full and compleat answer to all he has written (except what is merely personal) without breaking in upon that peaceable disposition which gives him such " an *aversion to controversy.*"

The Dr. affirms p. 18. That " nothing is to be " supposed the object, or any part of the object of " this charitable and royal institution, but what " plainly appears to be really so, from the very " words of the charter"— and a little after " the " words of the charter itself must determine and " limit the sense of the royal Granter, and conse- " quently the legal power conferred on the — " Grantees." We shall see presently how far the Dr. adheres to his own invariable rule of interpretation. He confesses " that the British plantations " or the King's subjects were really the primary, " more immediate object of this institution." And pray why not the sole and entire object of it ? There is certainly no other object " particularly expressed" in the charter, besides that of the King's subjects. Has he forgot what he had asserted but a few lines before, that " nothing is to be supposed " any part of the object of this institution, but what " plainly appears to be so from the very words of " the



“ the charter.” Why then are the King’s subjects said to be the *primary, more immediate*, and not the *sole* object of their institution? since they are the only object expressly mentioned in the *very words of the charter*. It was a strange oversight in this great critic, to depart so suddenly from his invariable rule; or perhaps there was a design to be served in interpreting the charter by way of implication, tho’ expressly contrary to his own rule of a literal interpretation; and that was to persuade the world, that this society was erected chiefly for propagating the Gospel among the Indians. To this purpose he has conveniently contrived two objects of this institution, the one “primary and immediate” “(the King’s “subjects”)” “the other the grand ultimate object, “which is the Indians bordering on the colonies.” But because the express words of the charter, which he had represented as the sole rule of their conduct, unluckily make no mention of “this grand ultimate design”, therefore he found himself under a necessity of departing from the rule himself had contrived, in order to adapt one of greater latitude. Indeed the Dr. assures us that this phrase “*the propagation of the gospel in those parts*,” necessarily “includes the grand ultimate design” before mentioned “of christianizing the Indians.” But pray Dr. why so? Is not the design of that phrase *the propagation of the gospel* fully answer’d, by preaching it to those of the King’s subjects who seem to be abandon’d to atheism and infidelity, and to those other “inferior subjects the slaves”? many of whom even in New-England are yet in a state of Heathenism. Does not the royal Grantor say expressly, “we think it our duty to promote the glory of God, by the instruction of *our people* in the christian religion?”

religion?" Is there a single word about the heathen bordering on our colonies? Why will he then force upon us a design which the charter does not mention?

What is here said is not intended to prove that the Society have not a power by their charter to propagate the Gospel among the heathen, for they really have such a power, and have accordingly made use of it, whenever opportunity has offer'd to do it with success; and will continue to do so notwithstanding his endeavours to misrepresent, and lessen the merit of their pious labours. But the author's intention is to show the Dr. the sophistry of his argument, and that the rule he lays down for interpreting the charter, would, if admitted, exclude the Society from this good work, and consequently that his argument by proving too much, proves nothing at all.

The truth is, the Society have by their charter, not only a legal power of propagating the Gospel among such of the King's subjects as are in danger of losing their christianity thro' atheism or infidelity, and among the heathen who have not so much as heard of the name of Christ: But (as ministring greatly to these purposes) of supporting the means of religion among those who have already, or who incline to receive it according to the legal establishment and provision of the church of England. In short whatever legal means are found necessary or conducive to secure or propagate the profession of christian religion as it is established in England, and all other his Majesty's dominions (Scotland excepted) and made a part of the constitution of the English nation; the Society have a right by their charter to make use of, understood in that generous view, originally designed and intended by the Grantor.

But



But to this the Dr. further objects, that the Grantor “ King William himself was bred up in the calvinistic principles and discipline, quite opposite in some respects to the episcopal, and is generally suppos’d to have retain’d a regard for the principles of his education all along ; tho’ as King of England and head of that church, there was a necessity of his *externally conforming* to its rites and discipline”—The reader is desired to stop here for a moment, and indulge his astonishment. Was this glorious deliverer then a finish’d hypocrite? Was he under a necessity of acting contrary to his conscience? of conforming externally to the church of England while his heart was not in all this? What blacker picture could he have drawn of those whom he calls “ the infamous race of the Stewarts” \* than he has here given of this excellent prince? A Prince for whom he pretends a respect, at least as much respect as he is capable of paying to any crowned head: For he assures us in a very solemn manner, that “ the greatest part of mankind now are, and almost always have been oppressed by wicked tyrants, called civil rulers, Kings and Emperors”. † So this perhaps is to pass for a light censure upon the memory of our glorious deliverer. And this suppositious reflection upon King William was introduced it seems to prove that he could not look upon the ministry in the church of England as orthodox, in opposition to those who dissent from the establishment. But he might have found a better argument to prove that he could and did look upon it in that light; for certainly better evidence could not be given of his regard for the church of England, and his desire to see it take place

\* Vid. Than. Serm. 1758 p. 48. † Vid. Serm. 12. p. 426, Vol. 1.

place and flourish in New-England, than his giving a hundred pounds sterling per annum out of the privy purse for supporting a minister of the church of England in Boston, and his bestowing a valuable library of books on King's chapel in that town ; to which (tho' not immediately relative to N. England) gratitude will oblige all true sons of the church of England in America to add, his royal foundation of a college at Williamsburg in Virginia for the same noble purpose. If the King himself could so liberally part with his own money to support what the Dr. calls the *peculiarities of episcopacy* ; it can hardly be doubted but that he would readily encourage the charity of others in doing the like. So that it is not quite so "unnatural" as the Dr. imagines "to suppose that *that* noble spirited Prince had "such an intention." Indeed it would be unnatural to suppose the contrary, viz. that in making a grant in favor of a corporation of the church of England, he should make use of a word in some peculiar sense of his own, and different from that in which he knew they had been accustomed to understand it. It may therefore very reasonably be admitted that by orthodox ministers in this charter, the Grantor did "intend "those of the English church, *not* in distinction from "all other churches in the world," but in distinction from all those churches in the English dominions, (Scotland excepted) who dissent from the legal constitutional establishment of England.

As pertinent to what has been here said, the following passage is inserted, with which Dr. Humphries worthily concludes his history of the Society. "In "gratitude to the memory of the founder of this "Society King William the third, it may not be "improper to conclude this treatise with remarking  
" to

“ to the reader, the erecting of this corporation,  
 “ was among the last public actions of his heroic  
 “ life. After having rescued the protestant religion  
 “ in Europe, and saved the church of England here,  
 “ he did by this last act, as it were bequeath it to  
 “ his American subjects, as the most valuable legacy,  
 “ and greatest blessing.” But the Dr. adds—“ to say  
 “ that the Grantees understood the term orthodox  
 “ in this narrow exclusive sense, is to reflect upon their  
 “ understandings.” As to their understandings, it  
 would become him to speak with reverence of them,  
 as what he is not qualified to take the measure of :  
 Nor is it any reflection upon them, that they should  
 understand the term *orthodox* in such a limited sense.  
 For as the words orthodox and heterodox do in  
 their literal signification import, the one a right,  
 and the other a wrong or different opinion, in mat-  
 ters relative to religion, so, they who adhere to  
 the legal established provision, are usually termed  
 orthodox, or persons who hold a right opinion, and  
 they who dissent from such establishment are said  
 to be heterodox, that is, persons who hold a wrong  
 or different opinion, whether their dissent arises from  
 doctrinal points, or ritual injunctions. Nor had the  
 Dr. any occasion to wonder that his antagonist  
 should understand the word *orthodox* as well capable  
 of the sense he had put upon it, since it is used in  
 the same sense in the historical account of the So-  
 ciety as quoted by himself.† With as little reason  
 does he charge that gentleman with not distinguish-  
 ing between *heresy* and *schism*, for he was not talk-  
 ing of heresy, but of heterodoxy, between which  
 it seems this learned critic knows no difference.

D

AND

† Observ. p. 101. 104.



AND this seems to be a proper place to take notice of another mistake that both the Dr. and his voucher have gone into, relative to establishments. The Dr. does not indeed seem quite so clear as his voucher, that congregationalism or independency are established in New-England; yet he has said enough to shew his inclination that the reader should believe it. Thus in his 16th page he calls the ministers and churches of New-England, the "established ministers and churches;" and a notable proof of their establishment he gives us at the 42d page, where he says, that the government of the Massachusetts-Bay made a law for the support of a learned and orthodox ministry, and this the Dr. calls a "civil establishment of religion." I suppose the government will scarcely thank him for this interpretation of that law, which really is charging them with invading the King's prerogative and establishing themselves: No says the Dr. in the next page, for the "acts which relate to the settlement and support of the gospel ministry here, received the royal sanction, and therefore our churches *seem* to have a proper legal establishment." I believe if the Dr. held an estate upon a title so precarious, as that of its being merely overlook'd, he would be solicitous of obtaining a better confirmation of it. Indeed he is so modest as only to assert that "they *seem* to have a legal establishment;" but since he knew that this was no establishment at all; it was perhaps not quite ingenuous to tell his readers that it *seemed* to be one.

IN his 72d page he asserts, that the Church of England "is not established here," which appears to be introduced as another reason why the New-England churches are established. But now if it should appear, that the church of England really is established



blished here, and has been so from the first settlement of the country; and that the churches (as he affects to call them) of New England subsist here as the dissenting congregations do in England, upon no other foot than that of a toleration: I suppose the world will not look upon it very modest in him to speak of the church of England in these colonies, as a *party*, a *faction*, *little episcopal parties*, *small disaffected and discontented parties*. †— It will be proper therefore to shew,

1. THAT what the Dr. calls the churches of New England are not established in the colonies. And

2. THAT the Church of England is, and all along has been established here.

THAT the New-England churches had no establishment till the act of toleration took place, is evident from their own confession; for such I take to be their sending an address of thanks to King James the 2d. for a toleration of religion. Thus the affair is related by Dr. Douglass. “Anno 1687. The ministers of Massachusetts-Bay colony, jointly sent an address of thanks to K. James 2d. for his indulgence, or general toleration of religious opinions and congregations; this was sent over and presented to K. James by Mr. Increase Mather, he and his constituents, were not politicians, sufficient to penetrate into the wicked and pernicious contrivance of that toleration.” The Dr. adds in a note that “by this general indulgence popery was craftily to be introduced; the colony of Plymouth unadvisedly sent an address of the same nature.” ‡ If previous to this they had apprehended themselves to be an establishment, we can hardly suppose they would have sent a person a thousand leagues to compliment that prince upon his granting the blessing of a toleration. A

† Vid. Observ. p. 55. 56. 57. 110. and in many other places.

‡ Sum. hist. & pol. p. 440. vol. 1.

A second reason to prove that the New-England churches are not established here, shall be taken from a letter of their Excellencies the Lords Justices to the Hon. William Dummer, Esq; which is handed down to us by the historian above mentioned, \* and is as follows.

‘ Whitehall, Oct. 7. 1725.

‘ Sir,

‘ THE Lords Justices being informed from such good hands, as make the truth of this advice not to be doubted, that at a general convention of ministers, from several parts of his Majesty’s province of the Massachusetts-Bay, at Boston, on the 27th of May last, a memorial and address was framed, directed to you as Lieut. Governor and commander in chief, and to the council and house of representatives then sitting, desiring that the general assembly would call the several churches in this province to meet by their pastors, and messengers, in a synod, which memorial and address, being accordingly presented by some of the said ministers, in the name, and at the desire of the said convention, was considered in council, the 3d of June following; and there approved, but the house of representatives put off the consideration of it to the next session, in which the council afterwards concurred.

‘ Their Excellencies were extremely surprized, that no account of so extraordinary and important transaction should have been transmitted by you, pursuant to an article in your instructions, by which you are directed upon all occasions, to send unto his Majesty, and to the commissioners for trade and plantations, a particular account of all your proceedings, and the condition of affairs within your  
‘ government.

\* Sum. hist. & pol. vol. II. p. 337.

' government. *As this matter doth highly concern*  
 ' *his Majesty's royal prerogative,* their Excellencies  
 ' *referr'd the consideration of it, to Mr. Attorney*  
 ' *and Solicitor General, who after mature delibera-*  
 ' *tion, and making all proper enquiries, reported,*  
 " *That from the charter and laws of your colony,*  
 " *they cannot collect that there is any regular estab-*  
 " *lishment of a NATIONAL or provincial church*  
 " *there, so as to warrant the holding of convocations*  
 " *or synods of the clergy, but if such synods might*  
 " *be holden, yet they take it to be clear in point of*  
 " *law, that his Majesty's supremacy in ecclesiastical*  
 " *affairs, being a branch of his prerogative, does take*  
 " *place in the plantations, and that synods cannot*  
 " *be held, nor is it lawful for the clergy to assemble*  
 " *as in synods, without authority from his Majesty."*  
 " They conceive the above mentioned application of  
 " the said Ministers, not to you alone, as represent-  
 " ing the King's person, *but to you, and the council*  
 " *and the house of representatives, to be a contempt of*  
 " *his Majesty's prerogative, as it is a public acknow-*  
 " *ledgment, that the power of granting what they*  
 " *desire, resides in the legislative body of the province,*  
 " *which by law is vested only in his Majesty. And*  
 " the Lieut. Governor, council and assembly inter-  
 " meddling therein, was an invasion of his Majesty's  
 " royal authority, which it was your duty as Lieut.  
 " Governor, to have withstood and rejected, and that  
 " the consent of the Lieut. Governor, the council and  
 " house of representatives, will not be sufficient au-  
 " thority for the holding of such a synod."

' Their Excellencies, upon consideration of this  
 ' opinion, of the attorney and solicitor general,  
 ' which they have been pleased to approve, have  
 ' commanded me to acquaint you with, and to ex-  
 ' press



' press to you their surprize, that no account of so  
 ' remarkable a transaction, which so nearly concerns  
 ' the King's prerogative, and the welfare of his Ma-  
 ' jesty's province under your government, has been  
 ' received from you, and to signify to you their di-  
 ' rections, that you do put an effectual stop to any  
 ' such proceedings, but if the consent desired by  
 ' the ministers above mentioned, for the holding of  
 ' the synod, should have been obtained, and *this pre-*  
 ' *tended synod* should be actually sitting, when you  
 ' receive these their Excellencies directions, they do in  
 ' that case, require and direct you, to cause such  
 ' their meeting to cease, acquainting them that *their*  
 ' *assembly is against law, and a contempt of his Ma-*  
 ' *jesty's prerogative*, and that they are forbid to meet  
 ' any more; but if notwithstanding such signification,  
 ' they shall continue to hold such an assembly, you  
 ' are then to take care that the principal actors there-  
 ' in be prosecuted for a misdemeanour. But you are  
 ' to avoid doing any formal act to dissolve them, lest  
 ' it be construed to imply that they had a right to  
 ' assemble. This Sir, is what I have in command  
 ' from their Excellencies to signify to you.

' And I must observe to you, that the precedent  
 ' quoted in the above mentioned memorial of such  
 ' a synod being held 45 years ago, falls in with the  
 ' year 1680, and that the former charter, upon which  
 ' the government of your province depended, was  
 ' repealed by scire facias in the year 1684, and the  
 ' new charter was granted in the year 1691, from  
 ' whence it appears, that if such synod was holden  
 ' as is alledged, it happened a short time before the  
 ' repealing of the old charter, but none has been  
 ' since the granting the new one.

I am Sir your most humble servant.

CHARLES DELAFAYE.



LET us now compare Dr. Mayhew's opinion with that of the attorney and solicitor general as given us in the foregoing letter; and to make the matter more plain to the reader, I will place them opposite to each other (as they are truly in themselves) in separate columns thus,

Dr. Mayhew's assertion that the New-England churches are established here.

1. The government of the Massachusetts-Bay, in the 4th of William and Mary, made a law for the support of a learned and orthodox ministry; it is needless therefore to look any farther back, for a civil establishment of religion here.

Obfv. p. 42.

2. The acts which relate to the settlement and support of the gospel ministry here, received the royal sanction, and therefore our churches seem to have a proper legal establishment. P. 43.

IT is really surprizing, that after such a letter as this (of which it is supposed the Dr. could not be ignorant) he should notwithstanding assert that the New-England churches are established. What becomes of his argument for a civil or legal establishment, founded on certain acts of assembly, not formally set aside, and therefore supposed to be confirmed by royal sanction, when the foregoing letter declares that the attributing such a power to the legislative body here is a direct invasion of his Majesty's prerogative. Whether the Dr. will incline to dispute this point with the Lords Justices, and prove that the Attorney and Solicitor General did not understand the colony charter, as he has attempted to prove that the Society do not understand theirs, I am not able to say. I shall leave him to determine that matter with himself, as he shall think best.

The Attorney and Solicitor General's opinion, and the determination of the Lords Justices thereupon.

1. From the charter and laws of your colony (viz. Massachusetts Bay) they cannot collect, that there is any regular establishment of a national or provincial church there.

2. The acknowledgment of such a power in the legislative body of the province is a contempt of his Majesty's prerogative.

BUT perhaps the Dr. may be better satisfied by an argument in his own way.—He lays it down as a rule for interpreting the charter of the Society, that “ nothing can be supposed the object or any part of the object of that institution, but what plainly appears to be so, from the very words of the charter, even tho’ it were certain that those persons to whom it was granted, had at the very time, some farther views and ends in obtaining it, besides those which are expressed, or plainly implied ; yet the words of the charter itself must determine and limit the sense of the royal Grantor, and consequently the legal power conferred—It was *only* for those purposes that are particularly expressed, not any private or secret ones, which they might possibly have had in their own minds, that they were incorporated.” Let us now apply this rule to the charter granted to the Massachusetts Bay. Nothing can be supposed the object or any part of the object of this constitution, but what plainly appears to be so from the very words of their charter, which very words must determine and limit the sense of the Grantor. It was only for those purposes that are particularly expressed—Let the Dr. now read and examine the present colony charter, bearing date 1691, and point out to us the passage or passages where in express words a power is granted of instituting an ecclesiastical establishment, or to use his own words, a civil establishment of religion ; but if nothing of this kind is to be found in it ; if such a power be neither the object, nor any part of the object of the colony charter, it is more than probable that there is no such establishment as the Dr. contends for existing.

IF any thing further should be thought necessary to confute the pretence of the New-England churches

churches being established in the colonies, I shall refer the reader to a letter sent from her Majesty and the Privy Council to the colony of Connecticut, Oct. 11th, 1705. See Doug. Sum. Vol. 2. p. 339.

IT has been now sufficiently proved that the New-England churches are not established here. We will therefore inquire whether the church of England be not established in the colonies.—This was before affirm'd.—I shall now attempt to prove it. One would imagine indeed that there should be no occasion to enter upon the proof of a thing so plain and evident as this is; since whatever difficulty there might be in determining this matter before, yet certainly there can be none at all since the union of the two kingdoms, “because, says Dr. Douglas, “by the act of union of Scotland and England, it “is provided that the church of England govern- “ment in all the English colonies was for ever “established.”† The same author observes in another place, that “by the articles of union of the two “nations of Great-Britain, May 1707, the church “of England is established in perpetuity, in all the “territories at that time to England belonging.”‡ I am a loss how the Dr. should overlook so plain a case as this, so as to deny the establishment of the church of England in these colonies, and to affirm that of the New-England churches. Possibly the Dr. never examined the point himself, but took it upon trust from his voucher.

BUT tho' it is undeniably manifest that the church of England is established in all the English colonies by the act of union before-mentioned; yet it may not be so clear, that this establishment actually took place before that time; and altho' it is sufficient to

E

the

† Doug. Summary, vol. 1. p. 440, 441.

‡ Do. p. 443.



the present argument, that the church of England has been established here from the time of the union aforesaid; yet for the sake of such as have not had opportunity of examining this matter, I shall lay the case before the reader, as I find it already done to my hands by a learned and judicious writer, in a letter to the Rev. Mr. Thomas Foxcroft, printed in the year 1745.

“THE christian religion (says this ingenious author) as by its evidence and intrinsic excellency it recommended itself to the English government, so it became by law the religion of the English nation; and the church of England likewise became by law their national church; and when any part of the English nation spread abroad into colonies, as they continued part of the nation, the law obliged them equally to the Church of England and to the christian religion. And the statutes for the establishment of the service ordination and articles of this church, made and confirm'd before and at the union of the two kingdoms, settle and establish it alike in *the dominions* of England, and in the realm it self.

“IN the reign of Edward VI. certain bishops and learned men by the appointment of the King, compos'd an order and rite of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments, in a book entitled, the book of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, after the use of the church of England. In the 3d year of his reign, an act of parliament was made (2d and 3d of Edward VI. c. 1.) entitled the penalty for not using uniformity of service and administration of sacraments, whereby it was enacted—That all ministers in any parish church, or other



“ other place within the *King's dominions*, should  
 “ be bound to say and use the celebration of the  
 “ Lord's Supper, and all their common and open  
 “ prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in  
 “ this book, and none other, or otherwise.

“ IN the sixth year of his reign, this book of com-  
 “ mon prayer, was by order of parliament (5th and  
 “ 6th of Edward VI. c. 1.) explained and perfected,  
 “ and a form of making and consecrating, Arch-  
 “ bishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons was added  
 “ to it; and by an act of parliament (entitled, uni-  
 “ formity of prayer, and administration of sacraments  
 “ shall be used in the church) it was enacted, that  
 “ the former act should stand in full force and  
 “ strength, for establishing this book of common  
 “ prayer, &c. as it was for the former book, and  
 “ that if any manner of person inhabiting within *his*  
 “ *Majesty's dominions*, should willingly and witting-  
 “ ly hear and be present at any other manner or  
 “ form of common prayer, &c. he should suffer  
 “ imprisonment, &c.

“ IN the first year of the reign of Queen Eliza-  
 “ beth a few alterations and additions were made in  
 “ this book of common prayer, and by an act of  
 “ parliament (1 Eliz. c. 2.) entitled there shall be  
 “ uniformity of prayer and administration of sacra-  
 “ ments, it was enacted, that all ministers in any  
 “ parish church, or other place within the *Queen's*  
 “ *dominions*, should be bound to say and use the cele-  
 “ bration of the Lord's Supper, and administration  
 “ of each of the sacraments, and all the common and  
 “ open prayer, in such order and form, as is men-  
 “ tioned in the 5th and 6th of Edward the sixth,  
 “ with these alterations and additions, &c. and that  
 “ every person inhabiting within the *Queen's Majes-*

“ *ty's dominions*, should diligently and faithfully endeavour to resort to the parish church, or some usual place, where common prayer and such service of God should be used upon every Sunday, &c.

“ IN the 13th year of Elizabeth, by an act of parliament, entitled reformation of disorders in the ministers of the church : The preamble of which is, that the churches of the *Queen's Majesty's dominions*, may be served with pastors of sound religion, it was enacted that no person be admitted to any benefice with cure, except he shall first have subscribed the 39 articles.

“ IN the 14th year of Charles the II<sup>d</sup>. the book of common prayer, &c. was by the appointment of the King reviewed, and in convocation altered and added to, and presented to his Majesty, and being approved and recommended by him to the parliament, was substituted in the place of that appointed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and the parliament by an act (entitled an act for the uniformity of public prayer, &c.) reciting that whereas the 36th of the 39 articles, is in these words, viz. That the book of consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordaining of priests and deacons, lately set forth in the time of King Edward the sixth, and confirm'd at the same time by authority of parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordaining, &c. and therefore whosoever are consecrated, or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the 2d year of the aforementioned King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated, or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly and lawfully consecrated and ordered, enacted that all subscriptions hereafter to be made

“ unto

“ unto the said articles—shall be construed and  
 “ taken to extend, and shall be apply'd for and  
 “ touching the said 36th article, and unto the book  
 “ containing the form and manner of making, or-  
 “ daining, &c. in such sort and manner as the same  
 “ did heretofore extend unto the book set forth in  
 “ the time of King Edward the sixth, mention'd in  
 “ the said 36th article. And by another paragraph  
 “ in said act, it is enacted, that the before-mentioned  
 “ statutes, for the uniformity of prayer and admini-  
 “ stration of sacraments, should stand in full force  
 “ and strength to all intents and purposes whatso-  
 “ ever, for the establishing and confirming this book.

“ IN the 5th year of the reign of Queen Anne,  
 “ by an act of parliament (5. A. c. 5.) intituled, an  
 “ act for securing the church of England as by  
 “ law established, it was enacted that all acts of  
 “ parliament then in force, for the establishment  
 “ and preservation of the church of England, and  
 “ the doctrine, worship, discipline and government  
 “ thereof, should remain and be in full force for  
 “ ever; and that every King and Queen succeeding  
 “ to the royal government of the kingdom of Great  
 “ Britain, at his or her coronation should take and  
 “ subscribe an oath to maintain, and preserve inviola-  
 “ bly, the said settlement of the church of England,  
 “ and the doctrine, worship, discipline and govern-  
 “ ment thereof, as by law established within the  
 “ kingdoms of England and Ireland, the dominion  
 “ of Wales, and town of Berwick upon Tweed, and  
 “ the *territories thereunto belonging*. - And by the  
 “ act of union of England and Scotland (5. A. c. 8.)  
 “ this act was made an *essential and fundamental*  
 “ part of the union,



“ I have now cited seven statutes for the establishment of the Church of England in the dominions.—These statutes are all now in force, and do equally establish and confirm the Church of England; her worship, articles and ordination, in the plantations and in England it self.” The force of the argument which has been drawn from them will doubtless prove satisfactory and convincing to every one who observes, that every subsequent statute that has been cited refers to and confirms those that preceded, and by that means throw their united strength upon the point here affirm'd; so that if plain direct positive acts of parliament have any force in framing and confirming an establishment, the Church of England is beyond controversy established in all his Majesty's colonies and plantations, and therefore in the Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut.

THE author does not recollect any thing that can reasonably be alledged against this conclusion, unless the passage which was quoted before from the Lords Justices letter, viz. “ that from the charter and laws of this colony it does not appear that there is any regular establishment of a national or provincial church here,” should be thought an objection. If this passage should seem to any one, to exclude the plantations from any establishment at all, whether of the church or congregational denomination: It may be answered; It is not the intention of the said letter to assert that there is no establishment of religion at all in the plantations; but that *such an establishment is not to be collected from any powers granted in the Massachusetts charter, nor consequently in the laws founded upon that charter.* And since no special power or privilege of this kind was conferr'd by the charter, it is evident that the state of religion  
in



in respect to establishments must and does in fact rest upon those acts of parliament which relate to this subject, and especially as they directly include all his Majesty's dominions; it being moreover an allow'd maxim not only that all laws made in the plantations contrary to the laws of England are ipso facto void, but also that where a case occurs for which the laws of any colony have made no provision, such case shall be determin'd by the laws at home. It appears then from all the acts of parliament that ever were made relative to establishments, that there is an establishment of the Church of England in the plantations, and that authority allow'd and ratify'd by the reigning prince, was the proper authority to make an establishment. "The King (under God) "is the supreme head of the church "of England, and if he had not appointed an "ordinary over New-England, it would have remained under his own immediate ecclesiastical "jurisdiction as supreme head. But it is well known "that his late Majesty, in the first year of his reign, "did impower the Bishop of London, under the "great seal, to exercise jurisdiction over the clergy "in the plantations, which were not in any Diocess, "but remained under the immediate jurisdiction "of the King." †

WE may now quit the subject of establishments, and proceed to consider the Dr.'s fourth section, which contains fundry "other things tending" (as he imagines) "to explain and confirm the sense of the "charter." The first is, "the name by which this "corporation is distinguished," viz. *The Society for the propagation of the Gospel*. This has been spoken to before; it will only be necessary to add here, that

† Vid. Letter above-mentioned, 1745.

that the Society have in their conduct acted agreeable to the import of this title, by sending missionaries into those colonies which the Dr. allows to be proper objects of their institution, by sending others to the Indian natives, and by appointing catechists to the Negroes. In short, they have so far comply'd with the import of this name or title, and with the design of their institution, that the Dr. himself is forced to confess, however unwillingly, "that the Society have chiefly sent their missionaries into those British plantations where they were much needed, according to the true design of their institution, and that they have thereby served the interest of religion."† But then he says, "they have deviated from the plan of their charter in some other respects," that is to say, they have sometimes endeavoured to preserve men from falling into infidelity by providing for them the means of religion,—forgive them this wrong—Doubtless every candid person will allow that their institution admits of the preservation as well as the extension of the gospel, and whether the one or the other be done, it must be done agreeable to the particular profession and sentiments of those who are the undertakers of this work. The Dr. adds, "for several years, he thinks about eight or nine, after the Society was founded, they sent no missionary into New-England, which may naturally be looked on (*he says*) as one argument that it was not originally considered among those plantations which were supposed to stand in need of their charity." But it is imagined that a better reason may be given why few or no missionaries were early sent into New-England, and that is, that few or no societies

or

† Observ. p. 51.

or congregations, appeared at that time to ask their charitable assistance. But afterwards frequent accessions of people of that communion from abroad, together with the effect of reading and enquiry at home, joined with the enthusiasm which at times prevailed, especially after Mr. Whitefields appearing among us, and which drove many of the more serious and considerate people into the bosom of the church ; these things occasioned such an increase of the church of England, that the Society found it necessary, to allow a greater proportion of their assistance, as it was now earnestly called for, and more apparently needed.

2. The next thing which the Dr. advances as limiting the design of the charter, is “ *the common seal of the Society*, which besides a sun in the upper part of the circle, has a ship within the circle under full sail ; on the prow of which stands a clergyman with a bible in his hand which he extends to a company of naked savages on the shore, thronging to receive the blessing, just over whom is a scroll implying these words *come over and help us.*” It is not easy to imagine what this proof was alledged for, since it either proves too much, or else nothing at all to his purpose. If it was designed to prove that the *sole* business of the Society according to their charter, was to carry the gospel to the savages, this would directly contradict the charter, which declares the *primary object of their institution to be the King’s subjects*, but if it was brought to prove that the conversion of the natives was one part of the design of their institution, this is no more than what we allow, and is agreeable to the conduct of the Society as well as their charter. Taking therefore the design of the charter in that sense, in which the society have all along understood it, and

F

agreeable



agreeable to which they have practised, applying themselves both to the King's subjects and the natives, and it very well agrees with the seal under consideration, but if applied wholly to the natives which is the use the Dr. seems to have bro't it for, instead of agreeing, as he says it very well does, with the charter, it really is a flat contradiction to it.

3. The next thing alledg'd by the Dr. in fixing the sense of the charter, is certain anniversary sermons preached before the venerable Society, some passages of which he has quoted, in support of his opinion; but this like the former instance produc'd by him, either justifies the Society, or else is nothing at all to the purpose. For does not the Dr. himself represent the design of their institution to be that of preserving and propagating christianity among the King's subjects, and extending it also to the Heathen? And has not this been the very practice of the Society from the beginning? And what do the anniversary sermons imply but certain exhortations to pursue the several objects of their institution; those which the Dr. has quoted insist chiefly upon one topic, while other sermons preached upon the same occasion enlarge on some other branch of the general design? As to the particular passages cited by the Dr. he himself allows, that they do "rather coincide, with the ultimate, than the more immediate design of the institution, and so harmonize rather more perhaps with the seal and name of the Society, than with the charter." What now are we to learn from hence, but that the seal and name of the society, which a little before he had produced to explain and support his sense of the charter, do really not harmonize with it at all, but only with the sermons he has quoted. So all he had been offering  
before



before by way of proof, from the name and seal of the Society is now given up again, as being (what indeed it was) nothing to the purpose. This gentleman has a very strange method of proving and disproving, of asserting and giving up again. Sure he could never expect to arrive at any solid conclusion, by this wanton method of arguing. The truth is, those worthy gentlemen, who have preached the anniversary sermons before the Society, have not all of them confined themselves to the same topics, but as the institution of the Society comprehended several objects, some have enlarged more particularly upon one object, and some upon another, as they severally thought proper, but all within the general intendment and design of their charter; and if the Dr. had intended to have drawn an argument from these annual sermons, in proof of the original design of their institution, he should have formed an abstract from them all, so far at least as they have enlarged upon different topics, and have given us the collective sense of the whole. But this indeed would not have served his turn; for he himself says "he is not insensible, that some of these sermons, especially within the last twenty years, have expressions in them of a much less catholic strain"; that is to say, they do not so well suit his purpose; and in truth he has taken the liberty to treat them accordingly, that is with great indecency, as will appear to any one who consults his 13th, 14th and 15th sections, as well as many other passages of his book.

The author has now gone thro' the Dr's representation of the Society's charter, together with the several arguments he has advanced, to support the sense he hath put upon it, and has endeavoured to  
 prove

prove that they are altogether inconclusive ; whether he has succeeded or not, must be left to the judgment of the candid unprejudiced reader. In the mean time if the account which has now been given of the charter and institution of the Society be just ; all the Dr's accusations of that venerable body, his charges of misconduct, misapplication of monies, and perversion of the trust which they have taken on themselves, fall to the ground ; and he has only to consider what reparation he ought in conscience to make, or endeavour to make, for the indecent liberties, and various abuse he has been guilty of towards them.

Here therefore the present examination seems to conclude ; but as there are yet many things in the Dr's book, which the author conceives to be extremely exceptionable, he thinks it proper to take notice of at least some of them.

It is a frequent subject of complaint with him, that the Society have not done enough towards the conversion of the Indians, tho' by their public accounts it appears that they have omitted nothing in their power, to promote that good work ; nor have they been entirely without success. He is likewise much displeas'd, that more missionaries have not been sent to those colonies, whose religious state he thinks to be but little removed from heathenism. What colonies he here refers to, we can be at no loss about, since he excepts none but those of Connecticut and the Massachusetts-Bay. He allows for instance that the Society might have supported missions in the colony of Rhode-Island with propriety enough ; and indeed they have done so, and possibly might have done more than they have, if they had not met with too much opposition from a party spirit. For instance, The Society upon a representation of the  
great

great necessity of a missionary in the Narraganset, particularly in South and North Kingston, at a time when there was no settled minister of any denomination; sent thither Mr. Guy, Mr. Bridge, and afterwards Dr. Macsparran to officiate among them. To give a check to these gentlemen's success, and lest the inhabitants should receive religion, as it is taught in the church of England; one Mr. Torrey was dispatched thither, who had so little pretensions, and so few adherents, that he could not find five persons to give him a call (which I think the platform requires) and yet is officiously continued there to this day, tho' his congregation, as I am informed by those who live in the neighbourhood, usually consists of scarce twenty people.

Again, The Society open'd a mission at Providence about the year 1722 or 1723, where at that time there was no settled minister of the congregational persuasion. But for fear those people should receive the benefit of religion agreeable to the church of England, a congregational minister was soon sent thither, and as it is said, even forc'd upon the people, who refused to pay any thing towards his support.

Once more at Charlestown in the Narraganset, an attempt was made by several church families in that town, to establish a mission for the benefit of themselves, and the tribe of Indians in that neighbourhood (at that time about 400) to which attempt the Indians were so well disposed, by the labours of Dr. Macsparran a neighbouring missionary, that the Sachem gave a piece of ground to erect a church upon, and a considerable quantity of land besides, as a glebe for a missionary. Accordingly a church was set up, and the laudable design in a promising way, when one Mr. Parks was sent thither, to give



a check to the attempt, who by drawing off a party, and kindling a spirit of enthusiasm among both English & Indians in that town, totally disappointed and frustrated the above design.\* Let the Dr. now reflect whose fault it is, that this colony has been no better provided with missionaries, and lay his hand upon his mouth, when it appears how indefatigable some people have shewn themselves to frustrate the Society's attempts, even in those places where he allows they might laudably have employ'd their charity. Let it farther be observed in answer to the Dr's principal objection, viz. " that the Society do not allow a " due proportion of their charity to the southern " *heathenish* governments, nor to the Indian missions." As to the former, several of those governments, *heathen* as they are, to their great honor be it spoken, have made a handsome provision among themselves for the public worship of God, and therefore do no longer need the Society's help. And as to the latter, he is certainly a very improper judge what obstructions and discouragements they have met with in their attempts to convert the Indians; he therefore speaks at random, and with great want of charity when he says they have neglected that part of their institution in order to propagate the church in N. England.

The Dr's fifth section contains his account of the state of religion in N. England, before and since the the incorporation of the Society. But this account in many things, can by no means be approved.

It is not the author's intention to call in question the religious character of the first adventures to N. England,

\* This list might have been greatly enlarged, but it is an invidious subject, which the author by no means delights in; nor would have mentioned at all, if the Dr. had not cry'd out so much about a party spirit, and faulted the Society for neglecting this colony,



England, he doubts not in the least but that they were serious well meaning people, and altho' labouring under some mistakes and prejudices, yet many of them persons of great wisdom and understanding as well as piety. Nor will it be disputed that they made "early provision for the public worship of God":\* But how far their coming hither was occasioned by their sufferings and persecutions at home, as also what their sentiments were as to religious matters may deserve farther inquiry.

In the mean time it may not be improper to take some notice of the great veneration the Dr. professes for the memory of these our pious fore-fathers, who first came into this country, for the sake of enjoying (as he says) purity of faith and worship. Could the Dr. have mentioned these good fathers without blushing, if he had reflected how widely he has departed from the faith which these good men professed, and that as to the most essential doctrines of christianity? † Or must we take his appeals and harrangues of this kind to be mere grimace, or rather a design calculated *ad captum vulgi*, to raise a ferment in the minds of the people, who cannot help retaining, and that very justly, a value for the memory of their progenitors? Whatever their notions of liberty, or purity of religion amounted to, they certainly had no great opinion of *the learned Socinus*; they entertained those *orthodox* opinions, at least concerning the divinity of the Son of God, which the Dr. has treated in so bold, as well as ludicrous a manner; and had he lived in their days, he

\* Obs. p. 40.

† See his sermons, on the terms of salvation—Of being found in Christ—Of justification by faith—and particularly his 2d ser. on christian sobriety—Compare these with the doctrines taught by the early writers and divines of N. England.

he must either have enlarged his creed, or felt the effects of their honest resentment. But tho' he has no right to take shelter under the merit of those good men who are supposed to have first come hither for the sake of enjoying a pure religion according to their consciences, since he is departed from that purity of faith, whatever it was, which they professed, as far as darkness is from light. Yet because this stale pretence concerning the design of the first adventurers as to religious matters is artfully and industriously propagated among the common people who have not sufficient opportunities of examining this matter, it will be necessary to give it a more particular consideration.

Dr. Douglass acquaints us that " Robert Brown, a  
 " hot-headed young enthusiastical clergyman, began  
 " anno 1580, to preach against the ceremonies and  
 " discipline of the church of England; he was per-  
 " secuted or baited and teased by the bishops courts,  
 " he with some disciples left England, and formed  
 " a church at Middleborough of Zeeland in the  
 " Dutch low countries; after some time this effer-  
 " vescence or ebullition of youth subsided, he re-  
 " turned to England, recanted, and had a church of  
 " England cure bestowed upon him, and died in  
 " that communion, anno 1630.

" A congregation of these Brownists was form-  
 " in Yarmouth 1602, being harras'd by the esta-  
 " blished church of England, with their pastor they  
 " transported themselves to Leyden in Holland;  
 " here they became more moderate under the di-  
 " rection of their pastor Mr. Robinson; and from  
 " Brownists changed their denomination to that of  
 " Independents: Being of unsteady temper, they  
 " resolved to remove from amongst strangers after  
 " ten

“ ten years residence, to some remote country in  
 “ some wilderness, where without molestation they  
 “ might worship God in their own devotional way.” †  
 Dr. Douglass adds, that they “ obtained an instru-  
 “ ment from K. James I. for the free exercise of  
 “ their religion in any part of America”; but in  
 this article he is contradicted by Mr. Prince in his  
 chronology; who says the utmost they could obtain  
 was “ that the King would connive at them, and  
 “ not molest them, provided they carry peaceably:  
 “ but to tolerate them by his public authority; un-  
 “ der his seal would not be granted.” ‡

Thus the first effectual settlement in N. England  
 was clearly made upon a religious account: But as  
 to the first settlers of the colony of the Massachusetts  
 Bay, understood as posterior to, and distinct from  
 that of Plymouth, they plainly acted as other men  
 usually do upon like occasions, from hopes of in-  
 creasing their estates, and providing an ample inhe-  
 ritage for their children. Having for these pur-  
 poses negotiated a settlement for some time, by a  
 Governor and Company residing in England, they at  
 length thought it most for the interest of the pro-  
 priety, that the seat of government should be re-  
 moved to the country they were settling. Accord-  
 ingly Mr. Winthrop was chosen Governor, and he  
 with his associates embark'd on board sundry ships,  
 of which the Arabella was admiral, with a design to  
 proceed to America.

As it was now pretty generally known, that the  
 Plymouth adventurers had set up a way of worship  
 different from the public establishment of the nation,  
 it began to be suspected and reported, that this new

G

company

† Sum. Hist Polit. Vol I. p 369.

‡ Prince's Chronolo p, 57.

See also p. 53, 60.

*James I*

*first settle  
made on a  
religious ac*

*Winthrop*



company had a purpose of the same nature, as soon as they should arrive in America. This came to the ears of Governor Winthrop and his associates, while they lay wind-bound at Yarmouth, and it gave them great uneasiness, as well it might, to lie under the odium of this slander, and occasioned their writing the following letter for their own exculpation before they put to sea, viz.

*The Direct* Extract of a letter directed to the Bishops and Clergy  
*of this letter.* and people of the Church of England, from on  
*Hutchinson's* board the *Arabella*, April 7, 1630.

For obtaining their prayers, and the removal of suspicions and misconstruction of their intentions.\*

—“ **WE** beseech you therefore brethren by the  
 “ mercies of the Lord Jesus, to consider  
 “ us as your brethren, standing in very great need  
 “ of your help, and earnestly imploring it. And how-  
 “ ever your charity may have met with some occasion  
 “ of discouragement through the misreport of our in-  
 “ tions, or through the disaffection, or indiscretion of  
 “ some of us, or rather among us ; (for we are not  
 “ of those that dream of perfection in this world) yet  
 “ we desire you would be pleased to take notice of the  
 “ principals and body of our company, as those who  
 “ esteem it our honour to call the church of England,  
 “ from whence we rise, our dear mother ; and we  
 “ cannot part from our native country, where she spe-  
 “ cially resideth without much sadness of heart and  
 “ many tears in our eyes ; ever acknowledging, that  
 “ such hope and part as we have obtained in the com-  
 “ mon salvation, we have received in her bosom, and  
 “ sucked from her breasts. We leave her not there-  
 “ fore as loathing that milk, wherewith we were  
 “ nourished

\* Prince's Chron. p. 205.

" nourished there, but blessing God for the parentage  
 " and education, as members of the same body, shall  
 " always rejoice in her good, and unfeignedly grieve  
 " for any sorrow that may ever betide her, and, while  
 " we have breath, sincerely desire and endeavour the con-  
 " tinuance, and abundance of her welfare, with the  
 " enlargement of her bounds, in the kingdom of  
 " Christ Jesus.—Be pleased therefore rev'd fathers  
 " and brethren to help forward this work now in  
 " hand—&c. Signed by,

JONH WINTHROP, GOV.

THOMAS DUDLEY, Dep. Gov.

Sir RICHARD SALTONSTALL.

ISAAC JOHNSON.

Rev. GEORGE PHILLIPS.

WILLIAM CODDINGTON,

CHARLES FINES,

*However problematical  
 may be what they need  
 they remained in &  
 they left no room  
 Doubt after they arriv  
 America.  
 } Esq's.*

*vid H. H.  
 Mass. H.  
 Page 19  
 This Paper  
 occasioned  
 quite what  
 first settling  
 Massachusetts  
 were of  
 of England*

Previous to any application of the foregoing letter it may be proper to observe, that Mr. Prince in his chronology gives testimony that these *pious people were professed members of the church of England.*

" For the information (says he) of the present age  
 " as well as posterity, they (this colony of pious  
 " people) were of a denomination somewhat different  
 " in those early times from them of Plymouth  
 " —they were 'till now," (that is, after their arrival  
 in N. England) " professed members of the church  
 " of England." \*

From the foregoing letter and testimony it is evident, that whatever the case was at other places, and with regard to other adventurers, the first settlers of the Massachusetts-Bay at least, those pious good men, who left " the fair cities, villages, and delightful  
 " fields of Britain, for the then inhospitable shores,  
 " and

\* Prince's chronol. p. 213.

*constat* "and desarts of America" did not do it from any disgust they had taken at the established religion of their country; but from quite other motives.—— They positively declare their veneration for the established church, that they *esteem it their honour to call her their dear mother*, that they *cannot part from the place of her special residence without much sadness of heart, and many tears in their eyes*, they acknowledge that *the hope they have obtained in the common salvation, they received in her bosom, and suck'd from her breasts*. They declare *they do not loath the milk with which they have been thus nourished, but bless God for this their parentage and education, that their intentions have been misrepresented; that while they have breath, they will SINCERELY endeavour the continuance and abundance of her welfare, with THE ENLARGEMENT OF HER BOUNDS, in the kingdom of Christ Jesus*.

After such an explicit declaration as this, written and signed with their own hands, how can the Dr. pretend that these men were aggrieved at home, that they "came hither chiefly on account of their sufferings for non-conformity," that "they fled hither as to an assylum from episcopal persecuti-  
"on" \*? Is the foregoing the language of the persecuted, of men suffering for conscience sake? In an honest and serious view, what foundation had he for calling upon people to "reflect on what their  
"fore-fathers suffered from the mitred lordly suc-  
"cessors of the fishermen of Galilee"? What truth in saying that this "occasioned their flight into this  
"western world"? Did our pious fore-fathers  
"throw themselves into the arms of Savages and  
"Barbarians, to be delivered from the unholy zeal  
"and

\* Obs. p. 39.



“ and oppressions of these lordly men, countenanc’d  
 “ by scepter’d tyrants ”? \* And would they at the  
 same time earnestly ask the assistance and prayers of  
 these lordly oppressors, and openly acknowledge the  
 spiritual benefits they had received from them? Read  
 my dear countrymen, read the words of our pious  
 fore-fathers, in the above letter, and compare them,  
 with this author’s licentious harangue, and pretended  
 vindication of them, and see with your own eyes,  
 whether the spirit of the one and the other have the  
 least similitude. In short either these pious good  
 men, were honestly attach’d to the church of Eng-  
 land, and serious members of her communion, or  
 they were not; the Dr. affirms they were dissen-  
 ters, they themselves declare, that they were faithful  
 sons and children of the church, *educated in her bo-  
 som, nourish’d at her breasts, blessing God for this  
 their education, promising to seek her welfare, with  
 the enlargement of her bounds*: From hence then  
 one of these two things must unavoidably follow;  
 either that they were dreadful prevaricators with God  
 and man, or else that they are sadly abused and slan-  
 dered, when contrary to their own express declara-  
 tion they are said to have been dissenters, driven hi-  
 ther by the oppressions and persecution of the church  
 of England. If the former was the case, let us no  
 more boast of them as pious good men; If the lat-  
 ter, let the Dr. consider, what recompence he can  
 make to the memory of these men, for abusing them  
 with the opprobrious charge of sectarism and hypo-  
 crisy.

And this seems to be a proper place to take no-  
 tice of a reflection which the Dr. very liberally be-  
 stows upon the established church of England, which  
 he

*Ny. Co*

\* Obs. p. 155.

he calls “ a cruel persecuting church” \* and says “ the first settlers of the country were persecuted out of England by the established church.” § And again, “ is it not enough” (says he) “ that they persecuted us out of the old world? will they pursue us into the new”? † And a few lines after he speaks of the danger of being “ consumed by the flames, or deluged in a flood of episcopacy”. A stranger would perhaps be led by this manner of expression to conceive, that not only fire and faggot were plentifully employed in England for extirpating dissenters, but also that the Dutch method of knuting was used towards them for the same purposes. These that have been mentioned are but a few, out of many, very many bitter terms he has thought proper to bestow upon a protestant church, universally venerated abroad, and generally esteemed the bulwark and glory of the reformation; a church remarkable for its tenderness, and kind reception of foreign protestants, when these have been obliged to fly from their native countries on account of real persecution.

I am sorry the Dr. has made it necessary to enter upon a subject so invidious as this, and which lies so open to abundant recrimination. The author is unwilling to renew the memory of those severities, that were too commonly practiced by all parties in the last century, and which seem rather owing to the temper of the age, and the mistaken maxims of policy then prevailing, than to have been the consequence of religious principles. The church of England, considered as such, has nothing in its constitution, that either necessitates or warrants a persecuting temper; and if any improper severities have at any time been used by the government, in supporting

\* Obs. p 40.    § p 46.    † p 156.

porting the established religion of the nation ; they certainly were as foreign to the principles of that church, as they are to christianity in general. Will this gentleman allow that the persecutions and oppressions exercised by the Presbyterians, Independents, or by what name soever he chuses to have them distinguished, at a time when they had the government in their hands, were the natural and proper effect of the religious principles of those denominations ? And yet a great number of the most celebrated preachers of those times, warmly inveighed against allowing even a toleration to such as professed the church of England, expostulating with the civil government upon that account, representing such an indulgence as a great sin, a betraying the cause of Christ, and frequently using, or rather perverting that expression in the Gospel, *compel them to come in*. Nay did not the violation of liberty and the rights of conscience rise to that height, as to prohibit by an ordinance under the penalty of five pounds sterling, the use of the common prayer, even in the most private manner, in a person's own house ? For a second offence ten pounds, for the third one years imprisonment. \* Should the severities exercised

\* And it is further hereby ordained by the said Lords and Commons, that if any person or persons whatsoever shall at any time or times hereafter use, or cause the aforesaid Book of Common Prayer to be used, in any Church, or Chappel, or publique Place of worship, or in any private place or family, within the Kingdom of England, or Dominion of Wales, or Port & Town of Barwicke, that then every such person so offending therein, shall for the first offence forfeit and pay the summe of five pounds of lawful English money, for the second offence the summe of ten pounds, and for the third offence shall suffer one whole year's imprisonment without baile or mainprize. Vid. Ord. of Lords and Commons 23d August 1645. printed at the end of the Directory. The not using or depraving the said Directory is by the same Ordinance made penal. And it is further hereby ordained that every minister which shall not henceforth pursue and observe the Directory



exercised towards the Quakers in the Massachusetts-Bay, (whom by the way the Dr. by an awkward peice of flattery endeavours to complement with his good opinion†) when by fines, imprisonment and death of some, ‡ the rest were obliged to take refuge in a neighbouring government; should these severities be attributed, not to particular indiscrete men, but charged as a consequence of congregational principles, would this be thought a fair or generous conclusion? yet these and a thousand instances besides, the effects of an indiscrete and wrong pointed

rectory for publique worship, according to the true intent and meaning thereof, in all exercises of the publique worship of God within this Realme of England &c. shall for every time that he shall so offend, lose and forfeit the summe of forty shillings of lawful English money. And that what person soever shall with intent to bring the said Directory into contempt and neglect, or to raise opposition against it, preach, write, print, or cause to be written or printed any thing in the derogation or depraving of the said Book, or any thing therein conteyned, or any part thereof, shall lose and forfeit for every such offence, such a summe of money, as shall at the time of his conviction, be thought fit to be imposed upon him, by those before whom he shall have his trial, provided that it be not less than five pounds, nor exceeding the summe of fifty pounds.

† Obs. p. 50.

‡ Anno 1656. By a law of the province of Massachusetts-Bay it was enacted; None of that cursed sect of hereticks lately risen up in the world, which are commonly called Quakers, are to be imported: Penalty upon the master £ 100 per peice, and 40s. per hour for any other person harbouring or entertaining them. 1658 a Quaker convicted shall be banished upon pain of death. Sum. Hist. Polit. Vol. I. p. 436. Again in p. 448 Some laws were made against the importation of Quakers and their proceedings— they were subjected to fines, imprisonments, whipping, cropping of ears (1658 three Quakers had their ears cropt) and banishment, and by act of assembly upon their return from banishment 1659 and 1660, three or four Quakers suffered death. This in course occasioned a national clamour, and the pains of death were exchanged into these of being whipt, only through three towns at the carts tail: But upon further complaints home King Charles II. in Council, by order, Sept. 9 h 1661, required the accused to be sent home for trial, and all penal laws relating to Quakers to be suspended.

pointed zeal, might be mentioned by way of recrimination. Will the Dr. allow that if any of the denominations, Presbyterian, Independent, or Congregational, had now the power of government in their hands, they would put on the same oppressive temper?—Surely he will not.—Nor does he find the church of England at this day practising any of those severities wherewith he labours to affright and prejudice people against her. No establishment in the christian world, is more gentle, or allows greater liberties to those who dissent from it, than the church of England. Even the Dutch, who are thought to afford as great liberty to conscience as any christian state, are never known to admit any persons into civil offices, who do not conform to the legal worship, which, altho' it be a reasonable caution, is yet more than the English government are nice in exacting.

WHATSOEVER may be the temper of particular men, it is pretty certain that at this time of day, all parties disclaim those severities which have formerly been too much indulged; the people of New-England in particular, have special reason to be careful how they countenance those who would promote such a disposition (to which some may think the Dr's manner of writing upon this occasion has no small tendency) lest the same effect should result from it, which has once been the consequence of such a conduct in the province of the Massachusetts Bay; persecution of their fellow christians having been one principal article which occasioned the vacating their former charter.† It was observed, that this Gentleman's writings have a tendency to stir up misaffection and a party spirit (which are the

G

natural

† Sum. hist. & pol. vol. I. p. 412.

natural fore-runners of persecution, where there is power to execute it) this was not spoken at random, as will appear from the following passages—  
 “ When we consider—what might probably be the  
 “ sad consequence, if this growing party” (the church of England) “ should once get the upper hand here,  
 “ and a major vote in our houses of assembly : (in  
 “ which case the church of England might become  
 “ the established religion here ; tests be ordained as in  
 “ England, to exclude all but conformists from posts  
 “ of honor and emolument ; and all of us be taxed  
 “ for the support of bishops and their underlings)” †

Now not to mention that the Church of England is already established here, and tests already ordained and in many cases required, as they are in England ; without any of those frightful consequences with which he labors to terrify the vulgar ; let it only be observed that the plain import of this whole passage is to persuade people to unite in excluding those of the Church of England, not only from all posts of honour and emolument, but even from the common rights and privileges of natural born subjects ; a scheme so notoriously factious and unjust, so evidently tending to divide and alienate the minds of his Majesty’s good subjects from each other, that all wise and good men must look upon it with indignation and contempt.

Dr. Douglass tells us in his Summary, that “ by  
 “ an ancient law of the Massachusetts province, none  
 “ were allowed to be freemen but those who were  
 “ church members, that is (says he) of the independ-  
 “ dent or congregational religious mode ; and that  
 “ only freemen were capable of voting in civil as-  
 “ semblies.” Upon which he remarks. “ This was  
 “ too

† Observ. p. 155, 156.



“ too narrow and confin’d, perhaps more severe than  
 “ ever was practis’d by the Church of England in its  
 “ most bigotted and faulty periods.” † To be sure a  
 greater infringement upon English liberty was never  
 attempted; such a law might well therefore be re-  
 pealed, as it soon was upon the King’s letter in 1662. ‡  
 And yet this is the very thing which the Dr. in the  
 foregoing passages seems desirous of establishing, not  
 by a law indeed, the legislature are too wise and just  
 to hearken to insinuations so fatal to liberty, but by  
 raising such a violent spirit of opposition in the peo-  
 ple as may answer the same end. Let any man read  
 the virulent passage now under consideration from  
 page 155 to 157, and having weighed the temper and  
 spirit of it, let him turn to page 175, and observe  
 the same man declaring, that “ he is far from de-  
 “ siring to inflame the passions of any one sect or  
 “ party against another:” and when he has done  
 this let him wonder. It is not expected he should  
 reconcile them, the author would not put the Dr.  
 himself upon so impossible a task as this.

SHOULD the Church of England prevail in New  
 England he is afraid we should “ all be taxed for the  
 “ support of *Bishops and their underlings.*” This  
 was certainly too weak an insinuation for one who  
 writes himself D. D. and rather discovers the writer’s  
 passion than his judgment. Even the lowest of the  
 people, are too much of *philosophers and divines*, to  
 be taken in at this time of day, by such mean artifice  
 as this; but it was designed to beget a prejudice in  
 the minds of the people against episcopacy, at which  
 he takes all occasions to express his dislike; and in-  
 deed his best friends must wish that he had done no

G 2

more;

† Sum. hist. & pol. p. 432. ‡ Tho’ the Dr. says no acts of unifor-  
 mity ever took place here, so far as he has learnt, p. 94 of Observ.

more ; but when he suffers himself to treat that whole venerable order, with an indecency of expression, which would be quite unbecoming if it were offered to the lowest of mankind, let the impartial reader judge from what temper it must proceed.

THE Dr. could not be ignorant that episcopal government generally obtained thro' all ages of the christian church ; that it takes place at this day in almost all the christian world ; that the protestant churches abroad, who are not so happy as to live under this form of church government, do yet express the highest reverence and esteem of it ; it would therefore doubtless have been more becoming to have express'd his dislike in terms of greater modesty than he has usually done in this and many other of his writings, of an order so generally held in veneration. Even the admired Calvin and Beza have highly applauded the episcopal hierarchy of England, as appears by their letter to Queen Elizabeth; the Archbishop of Canterbury, and others. They pray heartily to God for the continuance and preservation of it, bewail their own unhappiness in the want of it, and mention it as their unavoidable misfortune to be without it. As to Calvin, altho' he justly objects to that universal supremacy claimed by the see of Rome, as usurping the prerogative of Christ, he would not believe that any man could oppose the episcopal hierarchy ; but (says he, speaking of the Romish church) " If they would shew us such an  
 " hierarchy, in which the Bishops might so preside,  
 " as not to refuse subjection to Christ, but depend  
 " upon him as their only head, and refer themselves  
 " to him, then truly I will confess that they de-  
 " serve to be anathematized, if any such men shall  
 " be, who refuse to reverence it, and submit to it  
 " with

“ with the utmost obedience.”† To the same purpose also does Beza express himself. “ But if any  
 “ there be (which truly you will scarce persuade me  
 “ to believe) who reject the whole order of Bishops;  
 “ God forbid that any man in his right mind should  
 “ assent to their madness.”‡ And particularly declares that it was never his intention to oppose the hierarchy of the Church of England which “ singular blessing of God he desires she may enjoy, and  
 “ wishes it may be perpetual.”§ If foreigners could speak with so much respect and reverence of this venerable order; how great a want of decency does it imply in a subject of this nation, who owes his liberty and every privilege he enjoys to the indulgence of that very constitution which appoints them, how indecent is it, I say, to speak of them in such opprobrious terms as he has done in these observations, and in many other of his writings, of which the reader will hereafter find a specimen?

NOR is it the venerable order of Bishops only, which this writer has treated with such unbecoming freedom. Every part of the established ecclesiastical constitution seems to provoke his displeasure; but nothing raises his anger more, than that the Society should encourage the use of the liturgy in New England; his contemptuous ridicule of which, makes the greatest part of his 14th section. THIS,

† Talem si nobis hierarchiam exhibeant, in quâ sic emineant episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent, et ab illo tanquam unico capite pendeant, et ad ipsum referantur, tum verò nullo non anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt qui non eam vereantur, summâque obedientiâ observent. Calvin de necessitate eccles. reform.

‡ Si qui sunt autem (quod sanè mihi non facillè persuaseris) qui omnem episcoporum ordinem rejiciant, absit ut quisquam satis sanè mentis furoribus illorum assentiatur. Beza ad Tractat. de ministr. ev. Grad. ab Hadrian. Sarav. Belgæditam. c. 1.

§ Fruatur sanè istâ singulari Dei beneficiâ, quæ utinam sit illi perpetua, ibid c. 18.



THIS, so far as it is an argument has been urged by him, oftentimes before, and implies that he thinks the Society, have no right by their charter to support a public religion in New-England, especially to the neglect of the Indians and the southern *heathenish* governments; for if they have a right to support religion in New-England at all, he allows it is natural to expect they should do it in their own way, and according to their own sentiments. † To this it has already been replied, that New-England containing a great many negro slaves that are still heathen, a great many freethinkers and other misbelievers, besides a great number of people from Europe educated in, and seriously attach'd to the Church of England, is directly in the most literal sense, one object of the Society's charity agreeable to their charter. And **that** they have also given their attention to the bordering heathen, and to those other governments which he esteems little better than heathen, in such proportion as they (whom he allows to be proper judges in this case) have found encouragement to hope for success.

As to the liturgy considered in another light, and as the object of his particular aversion, without entering into any direct vindication of it; it may be no improper rebuke to his licentious freedom upon this subject, to remark, that the whole christian church from the beginning has made use of liturgies in the public worship of God, as appears from the several forms of this kind which are still extant: And the foreign reformed churches at this day, have not only each of them a public liturgy, but have given ample testimony to the excellency of that in use

† Observa. p. 12.

use in the church of England ; † which considerations ought at least to have check'd his unseasonable ridicule, and have taught him to mention with an air of greater seriousness, a subject which the christian world have agreed to venerate.

## THE

† In the year 1661 Dr. Durell published a sermon in defence of the English liturgy, some copies of which he sent to several the most eminent ministers of the reformed churches in France. From whom he received the following answers.

From Monsieur de l'Angle, minister at Rouën.

Rouën, ce 5. Decem. 1661.

Monsieur et tres honorè frere,

Je ne-fai si je vous ai remercié de vostre excellent sermon--c'est un excellent present que vous m'aves fait, vous le devez faire imprimer en mesme volume que vostre Liturgie Françoisè afin qu'il lui serve d'Ange Tutelaire, et qu'il l'accompagne, in secula seculorum.

From Monsieur Bochart, minister of Caën.

De Caën, ce Decemb. 1661.

Monsieur & tres honorè frere,

Je vous suis tres obligé des exemplaires de vostre sermon—Vostre texte est tres bien choisi, bien-expliqué, bien appliqué.

From Monsieur Gaches, minister of Paris.

A Paris, ce 8. Decemb. 1661.

—Je passe à vostre sermon, qu'on m'apporta il y à trois jours, et que je leu d'abord avidement. Si vous avies besoin d'approbation apres celle du Chappelain de vostre Evêque, j'y joindrois tres volontieres la mienne.

From Mr. de l'Angle, minister at Rouen.

Rouen, December 5. 1661.

Sir, my most honoured brother,

I know not whether I have thanked you for your sermon—it is an excellent present you have made me; you ought to have it printed with your Liturgy in French of the same volume, to be as its Angel Guardian, and to accompany the same forever.

From Mr. Bochart, minister of Caen.

Caen, December 1661.

Sir, my most honoured brother,

I am very much obliged to you for the copies of your sermon—your text is very well chosen, very well expounded, very well applied.

From Mr. Gaches, minister of Paris.

Paris, December 8. 1661.

—I pass to your sermon, which was brought to me three days ago, and which I forthwith read with great greediness. If you stood in need of an approbation, after that of your Bishop's Chaplain, I would most willingly add mine to the same.

These were followed by letters of the same purport from Messieurs Daille, the father and son, both ministers of Paris, from Monsieur Tricot, Monsieur Rosel, and Monsieur du Vidal, all three ministers of the reformed church of Tours.

THE author has now gone thro' every thing in the Dr's book which he looks upon to be material, i. e. which relates to the professed design, or principal argument of it. If any thing has inadvertently escaped him, which the Dr. thinks to be of consequence to his main argument, upon proper notice of it, he will readily wait upon him again. There are indeed sundry incidental reflections to be met with, but as they are foreign to the general argument, and especially as they have been honour'd with some proper remarks in a pamphlet lately published at Portsmouth in New-Hampshire, the author does not at present think it worth his while to take notice of them.

To sum up the argument on both sides——The Dr's book is entitled " Observations on the charter and conduct of the Society, &c. designed to shew their nonconformity to each other." In prosecuting this design the Dr. has given us his, or rather Mr. Hobart's sense of the charter ; this sense he has endeavoured to support, by adducing the title and seal, and sundry sermons of the Society in confirmation of it. After which, comparing the conduct of the Society with the design of their institution, as he has plann'd it, he finds them to be inconsistent, or to disagree with with each other. This is a short (and it is supposed) a just representation of the Dr's management of the present argument, which if he had pursued in a modest manner, without scurrility or abuse, no body would have blamed him? he would have been intitled to a modest and genteel reply. Whether he has observed this method, let the unprejudiced reader judge.

THE present reply is intended to shew that the conduct of the Society is not inconsistent with their charter, nor yet with the title or seal, or the anniversary



versary sermons preached before them. To prove this the author has endeavoured to shew, First, That the Society have always had such means of information, both in respect to the true meaning of their charter, and also in regard to the state of religion in the plantations, that it is morally certain they could not have been deceived in regard to these points. 2dly. The members of which that Society is composed, are in general persons of so respectable a character, that it is utterly improbable they would act contrary to their institution with design; and further that if they were inclined to do so, it would have been impossible to have succeeded in so iniquitous a purpose, because their charter obliges them annually to submit their whole transactions, to the examination of the Lord chancellor and chief justices of the King's bench and common pleas, who are purposely appointed by the Crown to see that the true intent and meaning of the grant be complied with. 3dly, The author has examined the charter itself, and compared the same with the actual conduct of the Society, and finds that they have pursued the several objects therein recommended, agreeable to their title and seal, and to the general purport of their annual sermons.

In examining the charter he thinks it appears, that the Dr's interpretation of it cannot be just, inasmuch as it renders it inconsistent with itself; so also his explanation of the seal and title of the Society militates with his interpretation of the charter, and serves to prove his mistakes as to both. His quotations from the anniversary sermons of the Society, as they relate to one object only of their institution, must be look'd upon as a partial representation, however they do not at all interfere with what is allow-

ed to be the sense of the charter, or with their general conduct, and consequently are nothing at all to the purpose for which they were introduced.

Besides this, the author has made a few casual strictures upon some of the Dr's incidental reflections, as they happened to fall in the way of the principal argument ; and he was the rather inclined to do this, because the Dr's quarrel with the Society, seems really to take its rise, not so much from any thing he saw amiss in their conduct, as from his inveterate hatred, and unreasonable displeasure towards the church of England, which he flatters himself could not subsist long in the country without the Society's countenance and support. And yet in this perhaps he is mistaken, since the providence of God has more ways than one of supporting his own cause ; so that if the Society should think fit to withdraw their assistance (which they will hardly do the sooner for such observations as his) it is not doubted but that God would raise up other helps, or some way direct to sufficient means for the preservation of his church. It was the advice of a wiser man than perhaps either of us, to the jewish council, when they were consulting how they should put a stop to the preaching of the apostles, and the early propagation of the gospel ;  
 “ Refrain from these men, and let them alone : for  
 “ if this council, or this work be of men, it will  
 “ come to nought : but if it be of God, ye can-  
 “ not overthrow it ; lest haply ye be found even to  
 “ fight against God.”

If the Society, either through misrepresentation, or by any other means, have been led into any mistake in the management of any part of their trust, no man will think that the Dr's indecent and  
 abusive

abusive treatment of them is the way to incline them to amend it. Had it not been better to have improved upon the hint which he has quoted from bishop Burnet, and by this means have excited their emulation? or as the bishop expresses it "have provoked them to jealousy"? Mr. Hobart referring to the same passage mentions some great things that have been done in regard to the conversion of the Indians by the Society in Scotland for propagating christian knowledge, (it is supposed by the care and management of their commissioners at Boston) with a small expence.\* Supposing the truth of this, (which the author has no inclination to call in question) every good christian will sincerely rejoice at it, and pray God that they may still meet with more abundant success. But then would it not have been infinitely more useful, and have discovered more of a christian spirit, if the Dr. instead of abusing the Society for the propagation of the gospel, had employed himself in giving a particular account of that other Society which has been thus remarkably successful, e. g. What has been their certain fund, what their casual benefactions, from whom they receive their money, and how it is expended, what missionaries they employ, at what places they are fixt, and what are their respective salaries, and lastly, what accounts have been received from them as to the fruit of their labours: Had he done this, in some such plain open and honest method as the Society for propagating the gospel have done, it might possibly not only have provoked them to emulation, but have opened to them some new or more effectual methods for rendering their pious designs successful. Certain it is, that no Society, whether incorporated or merely  
voluntary,

\* Mr. Hobart's 1st Address p. 129.



voluntary, whose single aim and intention it is to promote the glory of God, in enlarging the kingdom of the Redeemer, have any reason to be ashamed of publishing their transactions to the world: On the contrary it seems to be a duty to do so, not only to prevent suspicion of ill and improper designs, but also that their *light shining* out with a clear un sullied brightness *before men*, others may be induced either to join with them and strengthen their hands, or be led to set on foot some other pious and charitable work of a similar kind to the further advancement of God's glory.

As to Indian conversions the author's opinion is, that the Rev. and worthy Mr. Wheelock's judicious scheme of educating such of the younger Natives, as may be obtained, among the English at a distance from their own homes, and then sending them back to their friends and countrymen, whether as missionaries or otherwise; if it may be done in any considerable numbers, would have the best influence in civilizing the savage temper of those people, and preparing them for the reception of the gospel; This good design therefore, as it deserves all encouragement, so it is pity but it should be universally known. Mr. Wheelock has indeed published an open and undisguised, as well as a modest account of his plan, and of the progress he has hitherto made in it, but since it has not yet circulated so far as it might be wished, this little intimation is designed to promote its being more generally known.\*

But to return from this short digression.—If the Dr. should complain, or rather (since he has no  
right

\* The pamphlet refer'd to is intitled, A plain and faithful narrative of the original design, rise, progress and present state of the Indian charity school at Lebanon in Connecticut. Printed by R. & S. Draper, Bolton, 1763.

right to complain) if his friends should complain in his behalf, that in the foregoing remarks, the author has sometimes used too great a severity of expression, let them consider the provocation ; let them reflect on the indecent language, and various abuse, that the Dr. has poured out, not on single persons only, but upon public bodies, upon the most respectable characters, upon the established religion of the nation, upon those who come over to, or embrace it in N. England in general as men void of all piety and goodness, \* upon the most sacred doctrines of our holy religion — let them I say reflect upon these things, and then say whether there was not an occasion for some kind of rebuke. The author is very far from being fond of harsh and severe epithets, he had infinitely rather examine subjects of controversy with that *meekness and fear* which is prescribed by the apostle ; but even the meek and gentle spirit of the gospel not only allows, but also requires in regard to such licentious freedoms, as the Dr. has thought proper to use, that they should be *rebuked sharply*.

If any one shall still think that the Dr's foible is represented in too strong a light, that he has not been guilty of all that indecent abuse in his writings with which he seems here to have been charged ; let such person examine the following specimen taken from his own writings, most of them solemnly delivered from the pulpit. It is hoped that it will serve to satisfy the most incredulous, and besides it may serve to *shew the Dr. to himself*, and let him see how far he is departed, I will not say from the dignity of the sacred office only, but from the spirit of the gospel.

And

\* Obs. p 98.

And first observe the modesty of his expressions in regard to Kings whom he calls

Scepter'd Tyrants. Obs. p. 155. and says that

The greatest part of mankind now are and almost always have been oppressed by wicked tyrants, called civil rulers, Kings and Emperors. Vol. Ser. printed 1755. p. 426.

2ndly. Expressions in regard to the established church of England, its constitution, Bishops and clergy

An enormous hierarchy ascending by various gradations from the dirt to the skies. Obs. p. 155.

An hierarchy resembling that of the romish church, where *one great prelate presides* over the whole, with all the inferior religious orders, the lowest of which are as it were trodden in the dirt. Obs. p. 79.

He says that one of our Kings was wheedled and duped to his destruction by the furious

It is not improper to observe that the Dr. is sometimes in a better temper than what is imply'd in the opposite column

particularly when he declares that

he would not willingly and unnecessarily give offence to any persons of that persuasion (the church of England) Obs. p. 175.

That the main end he had in view (in writing his Observations) was—that of serving the cause of truth and righteousness—in distinction from all private party opinions whatsoever. Obs. p. 174.

He declares that he is far from desiring to inflame the passions of any one sect or party against another ;



furious episcopal zealots of that day. Obs. p. 157.

And mentions the bishops before the revolution

The persecuting anti-christian spirit of many prelates before the revolution. Do. 157.

And in the foregoing page speaks contemptuously of

Bishops and their underlings. p. 156.

In the page before they are stiled

The mitred lordly successors of the fishermen of Galilee. Obs. p. 155.

In the 39th page he says that before the revolution

Episcopal persecution was seconded by royal power ; which condescended to be subservient to the views of domineering prelates. Obs. p. 39.

In another passage he says that

Their unholy zeal and oppressions, *were* countenanced by sceptred tyrants, p. 155.

In which latter expression as well as many others of

another : so far from it that he would sincerely rejoice to be in the least degree instrumental of uniting them in the bonds of Christian charity, on the true plan of the Gospel. Obs. p. 175.

Has a great aversion to controversy. Obs. p. 7.

When once providence shall have put it in our power to live thus (peaceably that is in respect to our enemies) — we are wholly inexcuseable — if we should turn aside to vain jangling amongst our selves,

of like kind he has reason he says to think that

He speaks the sense of the far greater, wiser and better part of the people in N. England. p. 154.

As to this I have better reason to think that he is widely mistaken, and that the greater, wiser and better part of N. England do entirely disapprove his censorious indecent and uncharitable temper.

Having thus treated the bishops, the church itself could not expect better quarter, and accordingly he has characteriz'd the church of England, the established church of the nation, of which the King himself is, under God, the head, which he loves and has sworn to defend, to be,

A cruel persecuting church,—Obs. p. 40. to which that he might preserve himself from the censure of civil authority he subjoins,

As that was before the revolution.

selves, doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil-surmisings, and perverse disputings, instead of studying the things that make for peace, and the things whereby we may edify one another.

If we should henceforth live as becomes fellow-subjects and fellow-christians, in the fear of God, and brotherly love, &c. Serm. on the reduction of Quebec, p. 59, 60.

We may now pass to some expressions deliver'd by him from the pulpit, as contained in a sermon on the anniversary of King Charles's martyrdom. In the preface to which he speaks of Bishops and the clergy in general under the title of

Imperious Bishops and reverend Jockies.

And in the sermon itself they are stiled

Reverend and right reverend drones; who preach but once a year, and then, not the gospel of Jesus Christ, but—some favourite point of church tyranny and anti-christian usurpation.

p. 21. 22.

Speaking of the King, he says that

He supported that *more than* *senior* archbishop Laud and the clergy of his stamp, in all their church tyranny and hellish cruelties. p. 42.

The opposite expressions are the language of one who says he would not bring a railing accusation even against the devil, tho' he were contending with him, much less would he bring such an accusation against his brethren.

Vol. I. Ser. X. p. 354.

I am far from intending (says the Dr.) to debase preaching by scolding, or bringing a railing accusation, even against wicked and ungodly men. Nor will I forget the apostle's admonition to Timothy, Rebuke not an elder [or aged person] but intreat him as a father: as I hope I have not forgotten what he immediately subjoins,

There  
K



There seems to have been an impious bargain struck up betwixt the sceptre and the surplice for enslaving both the bodies and souls of men. The King appeared to be willing that the clergy should do what they would—set up a monstrous hierarchy like that of Rome—a monstrous inquisition like that of Spain or Portugal—or any thing else which their own pride, and the devils malice could prompt them to. p. 52.

Take a further sample of this Gentleman's meek spirit and temper.

Some contend and *foam* and curse their brethren for the sake of the athanasian trinity till 'tis evident they do not love and fear the one living and true God. Others you will see *raging* about their peculiar notions of original sin, so as to prove themselves guilty of actual transgression.

subjoins, and the younger men as brethren. Prac. Disc. on the earthquake, Sermon IX. p. 263, 264.

The opposite are strange expressions, to say no worse, for one who calls himself a minister of Jesus Christ.

Would not any serious person imagine that the opposite passage would have been full as descriptive (I know it would not have been quite so rhetorical) if the words *foaming, raging, quarrelling, fury* and *bitterness* had been omitted, or at least if some softer terms had been

transgression. About election till they prove themselves reprobates. About particular redemption till they shew that they themselves are not redeemed from a vain conversation. You will hear others *quarrelling* about imputed righteousness with such *fury* and *bitterness*, as to shew that they are destitute of personal. About special grace, so as to shew that they have not even common. About faith while they make shipwreck of a good conscience.

Serm. XI. Vol. I. p. 403.

It will doubtless be disagreeable to the reader to be any longer entertained with expressions and observations so utterly unbecoming a minister of Jesus Christ, or in truth any other disciple of that divine master. The author will here therefore put an end to the specimen with the mention of a trifling inconsistency which this otherwise accurate Gentleman has fallen into in the heat of his argument.

been substituted to express his displeasure at those who hold the doctrines he there mentions.

Mr. Apthorp had observed that the religious state of the country is manifestly improved as to its speculative doctrines, notwithstanding the immoralities we lament and wish to reform. After spending several pages (viz. from 83 to 92.) to confute this position, the Dr. concludes as in the opposite column—

It has been too common for people in New-England to express themselves in a manner justly exceptionable upon these points (i. e. the principles he supposes the Gentleman had refer'd to) Obs. p. 92. and in Serm. I. Vol. I. p. 16. He says it is one of the chief honors of the present age, that the principles of religion, particularly of religious liberty, are better understood and more generally espoused; than they have perhaps been since the days of the apostles; it were to be wished that practical christianity, had made progress in the same proportion.

THIS little contrast is left to speak for it self; but as to the forgoing specimen the author presumes the Dr's. best friends, must seriously wish that he had expressed himself, not only with more decency and respect, but more agreeable to the temper of the gospel: Others perhaps who have less tenderness for him, will also have less charity, and be liable to suspect that he deceives himself, when he professes a regard for that divine religion which disclaims all evil speaking, railing and reviling, and whose principal characteristic is love or benevolence, a principle which they may think he notoriously violates—  
Be that as it may, the author is of opinion that the  
Dr.



Dr. has no room to complain of harsh or severe treatment, no not altho' it should be more disagreeable than any he has yet met with ; unless he will be pleased for the future at least to treat mankind with more respect than he has usually done, not only in his book of observations but even in many of his sermons.

THE author cannot persuade himself to conclude these reflections without expressing his astonishment, that any gentlemen, tho' of congregational principles, and much more that the reverend gentlemen who are the spiritual guides of that denomination, overlooking the Dr's attempts to undermine the fundamental principles of their faith, should express their approbation of this his performance, which in the conduct of it discovers so little of the meekness and gentleness of the gospel. Can you, gentlemen, be so far blinded by prejudice or a party spirit, as tamely to give up those essential doctrines for which you have hitherto laudably contended, and which once you esteemed your glory ? Can you, I say, cherish and flatter the man, who has been labouring from pulpit and press to demolish the doctrines which your fore-fathers have handed down to you ? (while yet he pretends to venerate them) those doctrines, which by way of eminence, you have been wont to stile the doctrines of grace ? † Are these things of less consequence than an opposition to the church of England ? How is it then that you have complimented the Dr. with your thanks (for so I hear many of you at Boston have done) for his book of observations, who by his other writings, has been destroying the fundamentals of your faith ? Has he not been undermining the dignity and divinity of  
the

† Vol. of Serm. printed 1755, passim.

the son of God? † Does he not deny and ridicule the doctrine of justification by faith? calling it confusion and an unintelligible rant, † nonsense, † gibberish, || mere jargon, § a means of beguiling unstable souls to their destruction, †† an irrational unscriptural doctrine, of pernicious tendency with regard to the lives and manners of men. †† Does he not discard the notion of original sin, and brand the doctrine of imputed righteousness with the reproach of nonsense? And have you not, gentlemen, implicitly countenanced these, and the numerous other errors in doctrine which are scatter'd up and down his writings, by your unseasonable compliments for his late observations upon that venerable Body of men the Society for the propagation of the gospel, &c. Will not strangers, will not every one who shall read the errors which this gentleman has published, naturally conclude, that you, gentlemen, do abet and approve them, who have thus given your sanction to this his last, but not least injurious performance?—I speak it with grief and concern, are you so carried away with a party spirit as to countenance such abuse and misrepresentation of the church of England, while you have not the courage to rise up in defence of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the truth of his gospel?—Remember who has said, “ he that is ashamed of me and of my words, &c. “ of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when he “ cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy “ angels.”

BUT

† See vol. I. serm. IX. p. 267, 268, 291. Sermon. X. p. 341, 342. Sermon. XII. p. 417, 418. note, but particularly Sermon. II. on Christian Sobriety, from p. 57 to 68.

† Sermon. VII. vol. I. p. 173, note. † Sermon. VIII. p. 237. || Sermon. VIII. p. 249. § Do. p. 251. †† Do. p. 244. †† Do. p. 255.

BUT to return from this digression, if it may be called one.—Besides the errors in doctrine hinted at in the foregoing remarks, the Dr's reflection upon the Song of Solomon is sufficient to show how easy it is for him to discard even the sacred canon of scripture itself: Or perhaps it was introduced merely for the sake of the witticism. It would discover however both more wisdom and seriousness to reserve his drollery for some less important subject. But no witticism, nor any thing else, will justify the pernicious tendency of the doctrine of annihilation, to which he has given too much countenance in the following passage. Speaking of such as die in their sins; "The utmost they can hope for (says he) is to be annihilated after suffering unutterable torments: Tho' I do not assert, that they can, according to the scripture account, hope for so great a favor as even this would be, viz. to be utterly blotted out of being! However it must be confessed that some expressions of scripture seem, at first view, to countenance this supposition." † This will too greedily be caught at by those who have lived in such a manner, as to have no better hope in their death. It might not be amiss for the Dr. to take a review of his works, and expunge this and many other passages which certainly have a threatening aspect upon the religion of Jesus Christ.

BUT beside the ill consequences to religion, and especially among the rising generation, which may not improbably follow from the principles he is labouring to propagate: If the government enjoy any privileges by virtue of their charter, which they are fond of retaining; one may be confident that the spirit and temper of the Dr's writings, so far as it can be supposed

† Ser. Vol. 1. p. 475. 476. note.



supposed they are publickly countenanced, will be attended with no favourable impressions, where it is the interest of the province to stand in a favourable light. It were to be wish'd that this were more thought of by some well dispos'd people, who do not appear to be aware of the consequences, which such improper liberties may produce in regard to the civil interests and privileges of that province.

As the author firmly believes that this is not the general temper of people in the colonies, so it is hoped it will be received *at home* as the effect of this Gentleman's particular disposition only, and that of two or three of his abettors.

To conclude, the author apprehends he has now *shewn* the Dr. *to himself* (to use his own phrase) and he hopes has also shewn him to other people. The first with a charitable view to his amendment, the latter with a design to caution others against being misled. To these good purposes, it will not be improper to pray, tho' in the words of the liturgy, "that God would grant unto us all, that we may both perceive and know what things we ought to do, and also may have grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same."

---

A short Vindication of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, &c. against the Objections, Mistakes and Misrepresentations of Dr. MAYHEW, in his Observations, on the Conduct of that Society.

*By one of its Members.*

In a LETTER to a FRIEND.

*Dear SIR,*

**T**HE great difficulty I labour under in writing, must be my apology for writing very briefly, and attending only to the most material things.

It is too evident from the general current of Dr. *Mayhew's* performance, That, it is his aim to beget a prejudice, and an odium in his readers, against his antagonist, and against the church of *England*, and the Society, from considerations and reflections, either merely personal, or ludicrous, and often trifling, and few of them, relating to the real merits of the cause; which is a practice quite unbecoming a *just* writer, either in the critical, or moral sense of that character.

There is one grand imposition upon his readers, which runs through the whole, and is, as it were, the burthen of his song, in which, there is not the least truth, and for which, there never was the least ground, or foundation, as ever I could learn, viz. That the chief view and endeavour of the Society has been to convert presbyterians and congregationalists to the church, to the neglect of Negroes and Indians, and the *heathenish* colonies, as he calls them.

If they, or their missionaries had done this, they would have had infinitely more reason, and right in what they did, than the dissenters from the beginning had, in using all possible endeavours, to promote factions, and disaffect people, to the established church of *England*, in all quarters, and make all the profelytes they could, from her communion, to their confused parties and sects, issuing in downright rebellion: So that this, is alledged with a very ill grace, by one, derived from, and who is a violent abettor of that party.

It is true, every good churchman must rejoice, when any of our wandering brethren, who have been drawn away, from the bosom and communion of the church, or educated in prejudice against it, are reclaimed, and return to the unity of the church, and be glad to be instrumental, as God in his providence gives them opportunity, in reconciling any of them: But, as the Society was not incorporated for that purpose, nor was it ever their principal aim, I believe very few instances, if any, can be produced, of any missionaries beginning with any dissenter, with a view at reclaiming him to the church. I have been long knowing to the affairs of the Society, and know of no such instances.

We have indeed been treated with great obloquy by dissenters representing us, as little better than roman catholics, &c. On these occasions we have defended ourselves, as well as we could: and can any body blame us for it? And can any reasonable person wonder if this should sometimes prove the occasion of the conversion of some sensible honest people? Or if the meer curiosity of others attending occasionally on our beautiful and instructive service, should be the means of their being reconciled, when they see, that it does not consist of extempore human invention, but is a wise and judicious collection from the holy scriptures? so that, their very love to the scriptures, has sometimes led them to love the service of the church.

But it is said, That Dr. *Bray*, the father of the Society, reported, that in the *Massachusetts* and *Connecticut*, there was no occasion for the Society to do any thing, as they were provided for, in the dissenting way:—I answer, I knew Dr. *Bray* very well, he was doubtless a very good man, and I agree



agree to his report at that time, and should have made the same report myself: There was then (except at *Boston*,) but here and there a member of the church of *England*, scattered about in these provinces; and according to the constitution of the Society, while there was no congregation of the church in those parts, the Society had no occasion to send any missionaries thither: But does it at all follow, that when there came to be such numbers of conscientious members of the church of *England*, as to make competent congregations for worship, being not well able to provide for a minister themselves, that the Society had by their charter, no right and business, to assist in providing for them, merely because the dissenters in those provinces were already provided for? Can any reason be given, why a conscientious body of church people in these provinces, should not be provided for, as well as in any other province?—You will say, let them go to meeting, I answer, many of them were so candid, as to go to the meetings, rather than no where, tho' it was very tedious and disagreeable to them, till they grew in numbers, so as to make competent congregations.

Yea, but it is represented, That the origin of the church, in these provinces, has been generally owing to faction, discontent with ministers, and about rates, pews, and the like, and tho' the church is the established religion of our mother country, and in the act of union, is, (as *Dr. Douglass*, his favourite author allows) established in all the plantations; he is pleas'd in his great good manners, to speak of her in these governments, under no better terms, than those of party and faction.

How much truth there may be in *Dr. Colman's* account of the origin of the church, at *Newbury* and *Brain-tree*, I am not able to say, and that some individuals have had little better motives in conforming, than those mentioned, I will not deny, and perhaps some of the missionaries have not always acted prudently, and possibly some may have been in a few instances too forward; such things are common to frail human nature; however, this I know, that the general rule and practice, where I am acquainted, have been, to send male-contents, and persons liable to censure, back, to make peace at home, before they came  
over

over to us. But, suppose some things a little wrong, is it fit, that so respectable a body, as the Society or the church, should be reproached, with the forwardness, or misconduct, of a few individuals?

Let me, however, give what I know to be generally a true account, of the origin of the church in these provinces.

The true causes, and occasions, of the being and growth of so many congregations of the church of *England*, in these provinces, are these.

1st. As the country continued to increase, and there were many accessions from *Great-Britain* and *Ireland*, there were among others, many of the established church, who came over to settle in these colonies, as well as others, so that there was 50 years ago, scarce a town of considerable standing, but what had some scattering among them, and in some there were several families: In *Stratford*, for instance, the first in *Connecticut* that applied to the Society; there were at the beginning of this century about fifteen families, and five or six more in the nearest towns, that joined with them; and in 1722, when the first mission was established, there were about thirty or forty; now, on supposition that the first who settled in these provinces were dissenters generally, yet I know no reason why these lands should be thought so sacred to them, as to exclude the church, nor, why church people should not be at liberty, to settle themselves in these colonies, as well as in any others? And if they do, who can deny, that they have as good a right to enjoy their way of worship as their neighbours? And if they need, and obtain any charitable assistance, can any thing but envy and malevolence, make such a clamour against it? But,

2. So the case has been, ever since church people settled in these countries, many dissenters have treated them with much clamour and contempt, and frequent disputings have arisen, which occasioned many to procure books, wherewith to defend themselves, such as arch bishop *King's* inventions of men in the worship of God, the *London* cases, *Hoadley* against *Calamy*, arch bishop *Potter* on church government, and some *Hooker's* ecclesiastical polity, and such like. And their thus defending themselves, occasioned many

many inquisitive candid dissenters to read those books, which reconciled them to the church ; so that the dissenters themselves by thus censuring, and disputing, have occasioned the increase of the church, and I hope it may be truly said, in a judgment of charity, many both of the original church people, and of the proselyted dissenters have been sincerely conscientious.—Dr. *Mayhew* indeed, and some other dissenters, however differing in some things, as much, (if not more) among themselves, as either of them from the church, seem so bigotted to their dissenting principles, in one shape or other, and so full of themselves, that they scarce know how to imagine, that church people, or any who differ from them, can be conscientious ; but surely, any candid and indifferent persons, that know any thing of such great and good men, as *Hooker* and *Chillingworth*, must allow, that it is possible, for a church man, upon the foot of *Hooker's* ecclesiastical polity, and *Chillingworth's* demonstration of episcopacy, (to say nothing of arch bishop *Potter* and arch bishop *Sharp*, and the many others) to be at least as conscientious, as any dissenters in their way upon the foot of any of their various principles.

3dly. Another thing and what has of late chiefly occasioned the accession of multitudes to the church, was, the wild enthusiasm that long obtained among themselves, on which occasion, their own managements were in many instances, so extravagant and ridiculous, as tended vastly more, to drive their people into the church, than any thing we ever did to draw them over to it.—Particularly, that monstrous enthusiasm that was at first mightily encouraged by themselves fifteen or twenty years ago, in consequence of *Mr. Whitefield's* rambling over the country, once and again, who was followed by a great many strolling teachers, who propagated so many wild and horrid notions of God and the gospel, that a multitude of people, were so bewilder'd that they could find no rest to the sole of their foot, till they took refuge in the church, as their only ark of safety. And many of these wild notions (to say nothing now of the opposite extreams of arianism, socinianism, and independent-whiggism) continue among great numbers to this day, and have occasioned much hot contention among them in settling ministers, and often  
the



the prostitution of discipline upon the meanest trifles, which have occasioned many people to conclude, that if they must separate from their former brethren, who are in endless contentions and confusion, their best way must be to retire into the church, which is in peace.—Now, these are all known facts: Is not Dr. *Maybew* then very disingenuous to conceal them, and ascribe the being and increase of the church, only to petty and quarrels about pews, rates, and such trifling things, and to a meer spirit of faction?

But, it is pretended, great mischiefs have befallen the country by means of the church, (of which however, he gives no proof); to this I answer, certain it is, that great advantages have derived from it, even to the dissenters themselves: it has occasioned a great increase of knowledge, by their reading many of our excellent writers, from whom they have gained their best notions, and much greater correctness, than they had, both in writing and speaking; it has provoked them to emulation, and it is certain, that many of them have much better notions of God and the gospel now, than they had before, and have much improved in the knowledge of the scriptures and the evidences of christianity.—Certain it is, that they are now, much beyond what they were, fifty years ago, and as certain that they are greatly beholden to the church, for every thing of this kind, wherein they excel themselves.

And besides this, in proportion as they have become more acquainted with the church, they have much dropp'd their great prejudices against us, and malevolence, and uncharitableness towards us, and charity, and good neighbourhood have greatly obtained between us; so that, if it was not for now and then, such abusive and uncharitable scribblings of a few zealots, full of very injurious misrepresentations, we should soon coalesce, and come into a friendly, benevolent and christian temper, of mutual forbearance towards one another, and be united in our common weal—I might add, that in truth the church has been so far from meddling in the various contentions in which they have been almost continually engaged among themselves, owing to the weakness of their constitution, and their republican separating and levelling principles, that, to my certain know-

ledge,

ledge, it hath in many instances been a great check upon them, and much rather tended to heal and quiet, than exasperate them—And as to immoralities, I am sure, the church hath born as faithful a testimony against them, in every kind, as any of the dissenters have done; so that, if immoralities have increased, it is not owing to the increase of the church, but to the increase of mankind here, in proportion to which, from the nature of man, immoralities will abound; I believe however, it may be said with truth, that in proportion to her numbers, the church can shew, at least as many sober, conscientious christians, as the meetings: I know it to be so, in many places where I am acquainted.

Now, whether it was to give a specimen of the Dr's fine talent at ridicule and declamation, or, from a studied design to fright his readers, with an hideous spectre, that he might create in them all the odium and antipathy he could against the church of *England*, or, whether it was a little fit of the old distraction, or, whether after all, the true and principal cause of his bitterness against that sound branch of the christian church may not still be artfully concealed, I will not take upon me to say; but in page 155 you have a most hideous outcry, about persecution, hierarchy, tyranny and the like terrible monsters, that made sad work, it seems, an hundred, or an hundred and fifty years ago, from which, however he allows at last, we have now nothing to fear since the revolution, from our present mild princes, and moderate prelates.—Pray, good sir, what then was the matter with you, when you made this tragical outcry? Did you design to set a mob upon us? or what?

You know very well, that the constitution of the church is just the same now as it was then, and yet she abhors persecution, and tyranny now, (at least) as much as you do: Why should she then be charged with the doings of tyrannous courts, or some persecuting individuals, so long ago? or how can she be answerable for those things, which for almost these hundred years have had no existence, nor are ever like to exist again? or, what sense or honesty can there be, in raising these old spectres, long since vanished and gone, never to revive, meerly to blacken the church,  
and

and render her odious to the present age, while in truth the church is no more concerned in them, than your party, who you must needs know, have persecuted and tyranniz'd in their turn, as much, at least, as ever the government who then professed the church did: You know that persecution and toleration are merely political things, in which the church, as such, (being a spiritual society, a kingdom not of this world,) is in no wise concern'd: The church is the same; it is the policy of the state only, that hath altered, and I readily agree with you, that in putting an end to persecution, it hath altered much for the better.

But the good Dr. is still terribly distressed, about the hierarchy, lest that should obtain here, ascending (as he says, in his fine florid way, a-la-mode de independent whig,) *ascending by various gradations from the dirt to the skies!* But pray Dr. be sober a little—We have no pope! There are with us but three orders; bishops, presbyters and deacons, according to the model of the pure primitive church, long before the least step was made towards popery. And we know that we have stronger evidence from the *facts* both of *scripture* and *antiquity*, for the most wise, apostolical, and consequently divine establishment of these three orders, than you have for infant baptism, and the first day sabbath, of which you are with us so justly tenacious.—Your reasoning upon these points, and ours for episcopacy, from the original facts, is exactly the same, only we have vastly the advantage of you.—If our reasoning for episcopacy must fall, your's on those points must much more fall with it; as might be abundantly and incontestably shewn, if it was now before us.—And we do averr, we are certainly as conscientious in our attachment to our episcopal form of church government, as you can be to your presbyterial, or whatever you call it.—In God's name, then, what reason can be given, why we should not be allowed to enjoy our way, as well as you, your's? We do not envy you, why should you envy and malign us?—

Pray tell me sir, why we should not be allowed in this country, to be as perfect in our kind, as you, in your's? We do not want in the least to molest or oppose you, in your way, why then should you so vehemently oppose  
our



our being provided for in our's? You would think it a terrible thing indeed, (doubtless a degree of persecution,) to be obliged to go a thousand leagues for ordination, if it was your case: can you then have no feeling for us whose unhappy case it is? In truth sir, we do not aim at any thing but to live with you in quiet and charitable neighbourhood: We have not the least desire of an episcopate that should have any thing to do with you, or at all interfere with any of your proceedings, or, make any alterations among you, in church or state: We only want bishops, to ordain, and govern *our own* clergy, to visit *our* churches, and to instruct and confirm *our* laity: And I desire to know, what harm, such a n episcopate could do you? Nay; we do not insist upon a bishop's residing in either of your favourite governments: Let him live in one of your heathenish provinces: We should be content to wait upon him for orders, two or three hundred miles distant from you, rather than fail; Why then should you have such terrible apprehensions?

But the Dr. is moreover in a dismal pannaic, lest the church's obtaining in this country, should be of ill consequence to it's political affairs.— But why should he? Pray sir be calm—Is not this our country, and the native country of most of us, as well as your's? Can it then be, that it should not be as dear to us, as it is to you? Have we not all one common interest, as to our country's weal, being embark'd in the same bottom? Is it not possible for us, each one judging for himself, to abound in his own sense, as to matters of religion, and yet live in love, and be united heart and hand, in promoting the publick weal, and our common interests, wherein we are all agreed, and equally concern'd? I can see no manner of reason to the contrary, or any more danger, lest we should differ about these publick affairs, than if we were all of the same sentiments in religion: and have we not been as forward in our country's cause in the late trying times as any of you? Disputes will sometimes arise; But I cannot see, why they should more in one case, than in the other? You need not be in the least apprehensive of the churches being any other wise established, than it is already, or that any tests will obtain in such a

M

country

country as this.—Pray sir be easy, We mean you no harm—If you would be only as charitable and peaceable toward us, and among yourselves, as we are heartily disposed to be towards you, we might live very quietly and happily together, and there would be no occasion for another *Columbus*, (as you cry out) to explore any other *country* for you. We are neither French, nor Indians, nor Serpents, nor *Dragons*: Why so dreadfully afraid of being *consumed by the flames*, or deluged *in a flood of episcopacy*? I really pity you, that you should suffer your terrors and passions so miserably to run away with you! I tell you again, dear sir, we mean you no harm; we would only provide for our selves—Pray do not be so terribly frightened!—But O my country, dear *New-England*, suffer me to assure you, that you have infinitely more reason to be afraid of such as are no friends to a co-essential trinity, and the divinity and satisfaction of Christ, (besides other misbeliever's, and unbelievers, of which there are many,) than of those who without censuring or aiming to interfere with dissenters, are only desirous for themselves to enjoy the church of *England*, in its primitive purity!—

But the Dr. insists that *Massachusetts* and *Connecticut* come not within the Society's limits by the charter: I answer, this cannot be maintained, since they are not excepted by the charter, unless it can be proved that the congregations of the church for which the Society provides in those colonies, would not in the sense & words of the charter, *want*, or be destitute of *the administration of God's word and sacraments*, if the Society did not assist them: But this he does not, nor can he prove. Surely he cannot pretend that King *William*, who introduced the toleration of dissenters, would leave his loving subjects of the church un-tolerated, and under the necessity of receiving God's word and sacraments contrary to their consciences, or of having none.—It must therefore be his meaning to provide, that his loving subjects of the church might enjoy God's word and sacraments in these colonies, when such there are in competent numbers; for congregations, as well as in other colonies;

colonies; and so the Society (who must be supposed to be at least as good judges of the meaning of their charter, as Dr. *Mayhew*) have ever understood it, and when opportunity offered, have practised accordingly, not for the purpose of converting dissenters to the church, but of providing for conscientious people of the church, and who without this provision would have been in danger of as great errors and absurdities, as those of popery,\* and not without danger even of infidelity itself, into which I fear many of the dissenters have been tempted by the absurd notions of christianity which have been disseminated amongst us.

Now *lastly*, the great objection is, that the Society neglects the southern colonies, Negroes and Indians.

I answer, As to the southern colonies, *First*, The Dr. must know, that in *Virginia*, *Maryland* and *South Carolina*, the church is well provided for by law, so that they are out of the question—In *South-Carolina* they are withdrawing their missions, as they become vacant.—

*Secondly*, As to *Georgia*, and the *Bahama* Islands, provision is made and making for them as fast as may be, and as their occasion and application call for. And,

*Thirdly*, As to *North-Carolina* (over which he drops a pious tear) as far as I can find, ever since their application to the Society, they have been providing for them as often as they have been applied to, and as fast as they could find gentlemen to undertake missions, in those tedious and unhealthy climates; and it appears from the abstract of 1761, that a great progress there is made, and making, and the Society is very much engaged to provide for them, so that I imagine those must have been dissenters for whom he is so compassionate. And,

*Fourthly*, As to *Pensylvania*, *New-Jersies* and *New-York*, I believe no instance can be produced, where applica-  
tion

\* See Mr. *Beach's* Friendly Expostulation, just publish'd, page 30, 31. &c.



cation has been made to the Society, that has ever been neglected. Indeed, I am sorry to say, there are some few places, where no provision is made for religion, of any sort, that have contracted such an indifference to any at all, (two of which I myself have often urged and engaged my endeavours for them) that they could never be prevail'd upon to embody themselves, to build a church, or take any step towards applying to the Society for their assistance, who would undoubtedly do for them, even to the neglect of *New-England*. Now to such I could wish the Society to send missionaries without being applied to, as they would to *ab origine* heathen, and I trust they will do so, before long, if those people do not apply.

And now, as to *Negroes*, what could the Society do more than it does, and not without some considerable success, as appears by the Abstracts—Their missionaries every where instruct as many as their masters will send, and do instruct and baptize many, and have some communicants—They have several catechists, and Dr. *Bray's* associates, several schools (besides that at *Barbadoes*) who constantly instruct their children with good success; and they have sent one worthy missionary to *Cape Coast Castle*, who laboured there, 'till his health and constitution were very near ruined.— And,

*Lastly*, As to the Indians—Many missionaries have to my knowledge endeavoured to convert them, as they have had opportunity; and one in particular placed near a considerable clan of them, endeavoured to reconcile them to christianity, 'till some dissenters so prejudiced them against him, that he could do them no Good—And it is well known, that the Society, (always ready to take every opportunity) has sent several missionaries to the *Mohawks*, one after another, from the beginning, and that the Rev. and worthy Dr. *Barclay* was very laborious, with good success for ten years, instructed and baptized many, and had a considerable number of communicants. It is true, he laboured at first under some difficulty, for want of an interpreter; but it was not long before he acquired so good skill in their language, as to preach and perform the service to their perfect understanding, and was go-  
ing

ing on with very good success, till the last war, about 1745, threw them into such confusion, and the influence of popish missionaries, and the wicked insinuations of a certain great man in those parts, created such a disaffection in them, that his very life was in much danger ; so that he was obliged to desist.\*—However, the Society has still a number there not to be despised, and much more will soon be done ; one thing they intend in order to it, is, to maintain a number of lads together at *King's College* in *New-York*, to be qualified for missionaries among them.

Upon the whole, It may be truly said, what could the Society do more, that it has not done, and all intirely agreeable to the true intention and meaning of their charter. I cannot therefore, imagine but that the candid and serious, even among the dissenters themselves, must be sensible that *Dr. Mayhew* has most unjustly charged the Society, and that his own friends can scarcely be able to withhold a blush for him, at his indecent, as well as injurious treatment of that venerable body, and of the church, which is a part of the national constitution ; and also, at his mean and unworthy personal invectives against the modest and very deserving gentleman, who has been the innocent occasion of provoking his riotous pen.—But I must have done.—I would only add, that the worthy *Dr. Wigglesworth's* letter in the 165th page of *Dr. Mayhew's* book, much deserves the attention of the government both here and in England.—

I am,

Sir, with much Esteem,

Your very hearty Friend and humble Servant,

\* So partially and injuriously, not to say falsely, does *Mr. Smith* in his history of *New York* represent this affair.













